

The subcommittee will also consider committee print No. 3, dated June 17, 1943, which supersedes committee print No. 2.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

504. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated November 11, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Yaguez River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

505. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated November 11, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Turpentine Run and its tributaries, island of St. Thomas, V. I., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3006. A bill to improve the general social welfare of the United States and to coordinate and equalize social development by encouraging public thought upon social and governmental techniques; and to provide for an expression and recording thereof; to provide a reservoir of carefully analyzed and succinctly stated information on such techniques, such information to be classified, recorded, and maintained for ready reference; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3007 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make awards of compensation or pension retroactive to date of discharge or death in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3008 (by request). A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to include participation in military and naval campaigns, etc., on a parity with active war service and to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, to further define the term "veteran of any war," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 3009. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; and for the relief of owners of gold mines required to suspend operations by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 3010. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3011. A bill making an appropriation for the relief of resort owners and for the aid of convalescing veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing

the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation for the procurement and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway upon termination of the war; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1666. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Mrs. Ross Manley of Rives Junction, Mich., and signed by some 44 other residents of the vicinity, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1667. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 320 residents of Jackson County, Ohio, urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1668. Also, petition signed by 41 residents of Lawrence County, Ohio, urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1669. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from the Woolcott Milling Co., of Harrisburg, Ill., opposing the administration's theory of subsidizing business, stating it would be a waste of the taxpayer's money and contrary to the principles of democracy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1670. Also, communications from B. N. Beane, mayor of the city of Metropolis, and Wayne Kerr, of Harrisburg, Ill., favoring the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1671. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Alvena Rimstidt, of Salem, Oreg., and 49 other citizens of Marion County, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1672. Also, petition signed by C. A. Isbell, Canby, Oreg., and 19 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1673. Also, petition signed by Rev. Willard P. Andersen, of Canby, Oreg., and 38 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of love and mercy, the whole realm of truth resounds with Thy praise. Ever enable us to see Thee in creation, preservation, and in the redemption of this wide world. Almighty God, we are standing in the midst of a mighty contest against the powers of rebellion, against regular and organized government; these darken the face of our sky, deepen the criticism of our democracy, and give encouragement to the enemies of freedom.

Blessed Lord, in these most solemn moments, grant that our purpose and our ambition may not be ill-starred, but be

vindicated by honesty and sincerity. They who brave the storm and heed the greater light of truth shall identify themselves with an era in which men shall be born to happiness and shall no longer close their eyes in helpless appeal. Dear Lord, the hour is imperative with no room for doubt or hesitation; be Thou our voice clothed with the supremacy of divine power. How blessed is the prerogative and privilege of making our country the objective of our greatest devotion and sacrifice. Inspire the Congress to feel the unity and the inspiration of a high, common purpose, ever on the side of him who battles for the truth. The Lord God be at the side of our President and his advisers as they toil devotedly for those undying sanctities which make men free. In the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 19, 1943, was read and approved.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 2996) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNYDER) there were—ayes 54, noes 0.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—344

Abernethy	Cannon, Mo.	Engel
Allen, La.	Carson, Ohio	Feighan
Andersen,	Carter	Fellows
H. Carl	Case	Fenton
Anderson, Calif.	Chenoweth	Fernandez
Anderson,	Chipfield	Fisher
N. Mex.	Church	Fitzpatrick
Andresen,	Clark	Flannagan
August H.	Claason	Fogarty
Angell	Clevenger	Folger
Arends	Coffee	Forand
Arnold	Cole, Mo.	Fulbright
Auchincloss	Cole, N. Y.	Fulmer
Barrett	Colmer	Gale
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	Gallagher
Beall	Cox	Gathings
Beckworth	Cravens	Gavagan
Bender	Creal	Gavin
Bennett, Mich.	Crosser	Gearhart
Bennett, Mo.	Cullen	Gerlach
Bishop	Cunningham	Gibson
Blackney	Curtis	Gilchrist
Bland	D'Alesandro	Gillette
Bloom	Davis	Goodwin
Bolton	Dawson	Gordon
Boren	Day	Gore
Boykin	Delaney	Gorski
Bradley, Pa.	Dewey	Gossett
Brooks	Dickstein	Graham
Brown, Ga.	Dilweg	Granger
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Grant, Ala.
Bryson	Dirksen	Grant, Ind.
Buckley	Disney	Gregory
Buffett	Dondero	Griffiths
Bulwinkle	Doughton	Gross
Burch, Va.	Durham	Gwynne
Burdick	Dworschak	Hagen
Burgin	Eaton	Hale
Busbey	Elliot	Hall
Butler	Ellis	Edwin Arthur
Byrne	Ellison, Md.	Hall
Camp	Elmer	Leonard W.
Canfield	Elston, Ohio	Halleck

Hancock	McGregor	Rolph
Harless, Ariz.	McKenzie	Rowan
Harness, Ind.	McMillan	Rowe
Harris, Ark.	McMurray	Russell
Harris, Va.	McWilliams	Sabath
Hartley	Maas	Sadowski
Hays	Madden	Sauthoff
Heidinger	Magnuson	Scanlon
Hendricks	Mahon	Schiffner
Herter	Maloney	Schuetz
Hess	Manasco	Schwabe
Hill	Mansfield	Shafer
Hinshaw	Mont	Sheppard
Hobbs	Mansfield, Tex.	Short
Hoch	Marcantonio	Sikes
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Simpson, Ill.
Hoffman	Martin, Mass.	Slaughter
Hollifield	Mason	Smith, Maine
Holmes, Mass.	May	Smith, Ohio
Holmes, Wash.	Merrow	Smith, Wis.
Hope	Michener	Snyder
Horan	Miller, Conn.	Somers, N. Y.
Howell	Miller, Mo.	Sparkman
Hull	Miller, Nebr.	Spence
Izac	Miller, Pa.	Springer
Jackson	Mills	Stanley
Jeffrey	Monkiewicz	Starnes, Ala.
Jenkins	Morrison, La.	Stearns
Jennings	Morrison, N. C.	Stefan
Jensen	Mott	Stevenson
Johnson	Mruk	Stewart
Johnson, Anton J.	Murdoch	Stockman
Johnson, Calvin D.	Murphy	Sullivan
Johnson, Ind.	Murray, Wis.	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, J. Leroy	Newsome	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Luther A.	Norman	Sundstrom
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Norrell	Taber
Johnson, Okla.	Norton	Talbot
Jones	O'Brien, Ill.	Talle
Jonkman	O'Brien, Mich.	Tarver
Judd	O'Connor	Taylor
Kean	O'Hara	Thomas, N. J.
Kee	O'Neal	Thomas, Tex.
Keefe	O'Toole	Thomason
Kefauver	Outland	Tibbott
Kelley	Patman	Towe
Keogh	Patton	Troutman
Kerr	Peterson, Fla.	Vincent, Ky.
Kilday	Peterson, Ga.	Voorhis, Calif.
Klinzer	Pfeiffer	Vorys, Ohio
Kirwan	Phillips	Wadsworth
Kleberg	Pittenger	Walter
Klein	Ploeser	Ward
Knutson	Plumley	Wasielewski
Kunkel	Poage	Weaver
LaFollette	Poulson	Welch, Ohio
Lambertson	Powers	Welsh
Landis	Price	Wene
Lanham	Priest	West
Larcade	Rabaut	Whelchel, Ga.
Lea	Ramspeck	Whitten
LeCompte	Randolph	Whittington
Lemke	Rankin	Wickersham
Lesinski	Reece, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Lewis, Ohio	Reed, Ill.	Willey
Ludiow	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson
Lynch	Rees, Kans.	Winstead
McCord	Richards	Winter
McCormack	Robertson	Wolfenden, Pa.
McCowan	Robinson, Utah	Wolverton, N. J.
McGehee	Robison, Ky.	Woodruff, Mich.
McGranery	Rockwell	Worley
	Rogers, Pa.	Zimmerman
	Rogers, Mass.	
	Rohrbough	

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Konski

NOT VOTING—86

Allen, Ill.	Culkin	Kearney
Andrews	Curley	Kennedy
Baldwin, Md.	Dies	Kilburn
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ditter	King
Barden	Domengeaux	Lane
Barry	Douglas	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Drewry	Luce
Bell	Eberharter	McLean
Bonner	Ellsworth	Merritt
Bradley, Mich.	Fay	Monroney
Brehm	Fish	Mundt
Burchill, N. Y.	Ford	Murray, Tenn.
Cannon, Fla.	Furlong	Myers
Capozzoli	Gamble	Nichols
Carlson, Kans.	Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Celler	Gillie	O'Leary
Chapman	Green	Pace
Cochran	Hare	Pracht
Compton	Hart	Ramey
Cooley	Hébert	Rivers
Costello	Heffernan	Rizley
Courtney	Jarman	Rogers, Calif.
Crawford	Johnson, Ward	Sasser

Satterfield	Stearns, N. H.	Wheat
Scott	Tolan	White
Sheridan	Treadway	Wolcott
Simpson, Pa.	Van Zandt	Woodrum, Va.
Smith, Va.	Vinson, Ga.	Wright
Smith, W. Va.	Vursell	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wheat.	Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.	Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.
	Mr. Barry with Mr. Carlson of Kansas.
	Mr. Curley with Mr. Andrews.
	Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Ellsworth.
	Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Compton.
	Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Wolcott.
	Mr. Chapman with Mr. Kilburn.
	Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
	Mr. Cochran with Mr. Fish.
	Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Gillie.
	Mr. Drewry with Mr. Ramey.
	Mr. Hare with Mr. LeFevre.
	Mr. Merritt with Mr. Van Zandt.
	Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Vard Johnson.
	Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Gifford.
	Mr. Cooley with Mr. Pracht.
	Mr. Lane with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
	Mr. Fay with Mr. Douglas.
	Mr. Pace with Mr. McLean.
	Mr. Costello with Mrs. Luce.
	Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
	Mr. Courtney with Mr. Rizley.
	Mr. Green with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
	Mr. Tolan with Mr. Scott.
	Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Gamble.
	Mr. King with Mr. Ditter.
	Mr. Hart with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
	Mr. Jarman with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
	Mr. Bell with Mr. Crawford.
	Mr. Ford with Mr. Kearney.
	Mr. Monroney with Mr. Culkin.
	Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Vursell.
	Mr. Barden with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "no" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS FOR UNITED STATES SHIPS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the Radio Communication Service of ships of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill. The Senate amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 2 and 3, strike out "present war and for 6 months thereafter," and insert "until July 1, 1945."

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "the President by proclamation or."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a memorandum sent by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and the Railway Brotherhoods, to the President of the United States, requesting a veto of the so-called Connally-Smith bill. I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that the manuscript will cover one and three-fifth pages at a cost of \$72. I ask that the memorandum be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an address delivered by Dr. Eckridge at the Cumberland University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a speech I made to the Dairymen's League Cooperatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BANK OF AMERICA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, 1934

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Resolution 254 for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the resolution?

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to turn over to the Attorney General certain confidential reports filed with the Library of Congress in 1934 by the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I believe, at that time was the chairman. It has the unanimous approval of the committee. It is for the purpose of allowing the Attorney General to see these reports in an effort to assist him in the prosecution of certain alleged un-American activities. An amendment has been added, to the effect that the report shall be turned over to the Library Committee, so that if the Attorney General wants to see the

report, he can see it through the Library Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I had no notice that this resolution was to be called up, although I appeared before the Committee on the Library when it was being considered, and requested an amendment to the resolution. I would now like to inquire whether or not the resolution has been amended in a way that will permit any committee of the House of Representatives to see this material, or whether or not it is restricted to the Attorney General? I would like to ask the gentleman if any change was made in the wording of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution and the proposed amendments will be read for information.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 254), as follows:

Resolved, That the Librarian of Congress is authorized and directed to deliver to the Attorney General, for such use as the Attorney General may deem appropriate, all material deposited with the Librarian by the Special Committee of the House of Representatives on Un-American Activities, Seventy-third Congress, second session, including the contents of a sealed package inscribed "House of Representatives, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, 1934. Hearings Confidential," the content of which package shall be returned to the Librarian of Congress after the Attorney General has made such use of the same as he has deemed appropriate.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library"; in line 3, strike out the words "the Attorney General" and insert "that committee"; in line 11, strike out "Attorney General" and insert "House Committee on the Library"; in the same line strike out "he" and insert "it."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is a very important question involving the House of Representatives. The committee known as the McCormack-Dickstein committee in 1933 and 1934 made an investigation. They filed a report and recommended that certain laws be passed, which were passed, in connection with un-American activities. In connection with the investigation, some very important material, and I will say outstanding, astounding, and startling information, was obtained. It was of such explosive character that they did not feel they could afford to make it public. It was the first time in the history of this Government, as far as I have ever been able to ascertain, where such information was placed in a box. It was sealed up. Under the law, section 147, title II, of the United States Code, information obtained by an investigating committee should be turned over to the Clerk, and the Clerk, in turn, turns it over to the Library of Congress. But in this particular case it was turned over directly to the Library of Congress with this understanding, that this package would never be opened and the contents of it revealed except after passage of a resolution

by the Congress—not just by the House of Representatives but by the Congress. In view of the statute which says that the House of Representatives has control of its papers, this simple resolution will be sufficient to authorize the inspection of that material. But that is not the point exactly. The House of Representatives asked that this investigation be conducted.

The House of Representatives appropriated the money with which to conduct the investigation. The material and information obtained by that committee should be used by other committees. The fact of the business is that when the Dies committee was created, that should have been the first material to go to the Dies committee, because it involved un-American activities. I can state to you it involved some very startling information. I brought it to the attention of this House several years ago and it went by unnoticed. In 1940, when I was appearing before the Dies committee, I requested that committee to offer a resolution and ask permission for the Dies committee to examine this information. That was 3 years ago, in 1940. Nothing has been done about it. The Attorney General, of course, would like to have this information and I would like to have him have it, but at the same time he is an appointive officer, and it places us in the position of being willing to turn over this information, which is very valuable, to an appointive officer of our Government and deny to our own people who are investigating this very question the right and privilege and opportunity of inspecting these papers.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. As I understand the resolution, it provides that these very important papers—if they are—will be turned over to the Committee on the Library of this House.

Mr. PATMAN. Will they be subject to inspection by other Members of the House?

Mr. McGRANERY. I should feel that the House has confidence in the discretion that its own committee would use in permitting the inspection. I would like to correct the gentleman. As I read the resolution it does not provide for turning over anything to the Attorney General, but it does provide for the turning over of these papers to the committee itself. This inspection will be made under the direction of the committee. I certainly feel that if a matter of importance would be before one of the other standing committees of the House, the chairman of that committee might certainly go before the Committee on the Library and discuss with them the question of the inspection of these papers. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman agree that any committee of this House—certainly the House can trust its own committees. There is the Kerr committee. They should have this information. The Dies committee should have this information. Why should other committees be compelled to go before

the Committee on the Library and convince them that they should see this important information? I cannot understand that. I hope the chairman of the Committee on the Library will agree to an amendment which will permit any committee of this House to inspect that material. That is fair. That is reasonable. I hope the gentleman will agree to such an amendment. If he will agree to it, of course I shall have no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Did the gentleman at the hearing receive any information that indicated that the Attorney General alone should see these papers?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] appeared for himself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] who were on this original committee. I will state now that that committee did a fine job. They did an excellent job. They finished up their job rapidly and made reports and recommended legislation which was passed, and then they quit. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] insisted that the Attorney General was the only one who should, under any circumstances, be allowed to inspect this material.

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McGRANERY. I would like to say for the information of this House that this very important trial is now in progress.

This information, if it has any relative value or merit in the trial of these cases before the Court, the Attorney General's office ought to have that evidence, and should not be hamstrung by a particular amendment which we can work out as among ourselves with a committee that will exercise judicial discretion in the power we grant. I do not think that, in view of the tremendous importance of this question to the American people, any Member of this House will be opposed to the passage of this resolution.

Mr. PATMAN. In reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, may I state that this was called to the attention of Congress more than 3 years ago, and is brought up now at the request of those who are conducting hearings to see if use cannot be made of this material.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. We are dealing here with enemies of the American Government and I cannot understand why there ought to be any secrecy about this report or these hearings.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct, so far as the committee are concerned.

Mr. NORRELL. I cannot see why it should not be turned over to different committees of the Congress, the press, and the American public.

Mr. PATMAN. I would not be willing to turn it over to the press without it first being considered by a committee.

Mr. NORRELL. I am willing to turn it over to everybody.

Mr. PATMAN. Not until the matter has been made public. There are certain things involved here that should not be made a matter of public discussion, but there are certain things that are material to the investigation and the files ought to be made available to these committees.

Mr. NORRELL. I think the Congress ought to have acted on this resolution before now.

Mr. PATMAN. We should have done it years ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us get the situation clear. If there is anything of an explosive nature in it—of course, my mind cannot go back and remember all of the things that took place in 1934—but if there is anything of an explosive nature in it, I have no recollection of it at the present time. The committee pursued the regular procedure. At the end of the committee's consideration the late Congressman Kramer was acting as secretary and sent the files to the Librarian.

By statute it is provided, in section 144 of the United States Code, as follows:

The Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to deliver to the Librarian of Congress all bound volumes of original papers, general petitions, printed matter, books, and manuscripts on June 6, 1900, in, or that may thereafter have come into, or may come into, the files of the House, which, in his judgment, are not required to be retained in the immediate custody of the file clerk; and it shall be the duty of the Librarian of Congress to cause all such matter so delivered to him to be properly classified by Congress and arranged for preservation and ready reference. All of such matter to be held as a part of the files of the House of Representatives, subject to its orders and rules.

Instead of delivering it to the Clerk, apparently it was delivered direct to the Librarian.

At the present time the Department of Justice has some cases pending and its representatives would like to look at the record and papers on file in the Librarian's office. That is the immediate situation which prompted the introduction of the pending resolution.

So far as any committee is concerned, a separate resolution can be introduced at a later time.

Mr. PATMAN. Why wait until a later time? Why not do it now, so that the committees of the House will have the same privilege of examining that testimony that is in the hands or custody of the Librarian.

Mr. McCORMACK. The pressing situation is that cases are pending which the Department of Justice wants to try and certainly I do not think the gentleman from Texas is going to object to that.

Mr. PATMAN. That could be done if they give them this authority.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but I do not know how far reaching such amend-

ment might be. Let me make this statement: As chairman of the special committee, I desire to state that about 90 percent of the information received resulted from anonymous sources. I have no criticism to offer of anyone who feels it necessary to publish any amount of testimony as a result of such investigation, which might result in the reputation of decent men being destroyed.

We went into executive session so the committee could find out whether on the information received we would be justified in acting upon anonymous information in public hearings. It was our duty to investigate all information called to our attention, but, in all decency, it was our duty to investigate the truth of this anonymous information and to bring the persons in later if we wanted them. Hearsay evidence was obtained, and we certainly would not let such witnesses appear in a public hearing where the reputation of honorable people, on hearsay evidence, might be destroyed. Every piece of evidence that was pertinent to the investigation was made public; every bit of the evidence that was adduced as a result of inquiries, that was considered pertinent to the matter under inquiry, was made public; it is in the public hearings, and that evidence was marked separate from the hearsay evidence. I remember some of the hearsay evidence. I remember some of the evidence related to the activities of the Japanese and that might be of importance at the present time. The purpose of this resolution is to enable the Department of Justice to see what evidence is in the papers on file and determine whether or not any of it can be used in connection with the trials, and so they can go into that matter now and see whether they wish to use it.

I personally have no objection to the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Texas, but I think it should be introduced as a separate resolution and considered by the Library Committee.

So far as I am concerned if the House votes to make it all public I do not care, but certainly I would not vote to make public evidence that is hearsay, evidence that is taken in executive session where a witness is allowed to say anything he or she wants to say, hearsay evidence in relation to honorable people. For instance, we had the late Gen. Smedley Butler before us. There was a Fascist plot in this country. They approached Smedley Butler. Smedley Butler was pulling them on. He was a fine American, as we all know. He was getting the evidence from them and he gave the evidence to us. Those who approached him were giving him a lot of this information to the effect that this person or that person would do this or would do that and not saying that they were a part of the plot, but indicating that they could be influenced, that they were interested in a vicious un-American plot. We uncovered a certain group in New York who had sent a man over to Europe to investigate the Fascist set-up in various nations where it existed among the veterans of those countries. In connection with General Butler's testimony the names of a number of very fine

honorable men were used. He was told by others, not by them but by others, something in relation to those men that you, or I, or no honorable man would for a moment believe or place credence in. General Butler told the committee a lot of stuff, but some that he told us was hearsay evidence. We made public all of the evidence that he gave that was pertinent, that was material, and that was competent in any way, but where hearsay evidence was used that naturally and properly should be kept in executive session. Certainly after these years it is going to do no good to make public a lot of evidence of that kind. I have no objection personally, but I think the thing should be looked into by the committee. This resolution should pass today and the gentleman from Texas should introduce a separate resolution tomorrow and to go before the Committee on the Library. Then the matter can be considered separately.

To have an amendment adopted to this resolution today without knowing what its implications might be—while my offhand opinion now is that I would not object to it, I would not want to say that I would want to see such an amendment accepted where we have an immediate situation to meet. I am sure the gentleman from Texas does not want to be put in a position of stopping the Department of Justice from being able to see whatever the files contain.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has known for a long time about this, and, of course, it could have been introduced long before. I am not going to be swept off my feet by any urgency of the case when it has been neglected for many, many years. Doubtless some of this evidence should not be in the public press; some of it should remain confidential and executive. Why say that we can only trust the Committee on the Library? Why not trust other committees of the House? Why say that the Committee on the Library is the only one we can rely on? I know they are good Members of Congress, and they are reliable, responsible, but, at the same time, there are other committees of this House that have these problems directly in charge and should have this same power, and right, and privilege of inspecting that material. Take the Japanese situation: I happen to know that there is an amount of information about the Japanese. The gentleman touched on it briefly. I can say a lot about it; and who can tell, if this information had been available, I am not so sure that we would not have known more than we did before the Pearl Harbor attack. Here we are in the House of Representatives seeing a committee trying to get valuable information, so valuable that they break a precedent of 150 years to place it under lock and key, and then we do not use it at all, and other committees, either, do not have access to it. Let me invite your attention to the fact that when this evidence and material, that package we will say, was delivered to the Library of Congress, the committee was not content just to say: "It shall not be made public;" the committee required the Librarian at that

time to sign a statement—it is in the committee hearings—are those committee hearings printed? The effect of that statement is—

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a suggestion if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to suggest that it may be pleasing all around that this matter be laid aside for the time being.

Mr. PATMAN. I should like to be notified if it comes up again; I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] to notify me. I was not notified that it was coming up today; I just happened to be here.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will notify the gentleman from Texas before the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] to call up this resolution.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York withdraws his request.

REPORT ON THE FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce to the House that on tomorrow at 10 o'clock Judge Marvin Jones will appear before our committee, the Committee on Agriculture, House Office Building, room 324, to give an account of the food conference held recently in the State of Virginia. This is an open meeting and any Member of the House interested will be very welcome to meet with us and hear about this conference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the press be invited?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a eulogy delivered by Senator

REED, of Kansas, at the funeral of our late colleague, U. S. Guyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

THE CRITICAL FOOD SITUATION

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress must not recess until it has taken some constructive action with regard to the food problem. It is daily becoming more confusing and critical. The administration either cannot or will not recognize its importance.

The appointment of Mr. Chester Davis as Food Administrator was widely hailed as an excellent one. Mr. Davis understands the problem. He has tried to do a good job. He is still doing a good job insofar as he is permitted to do so. Yet the situation has steadily deteriorated. Not only has the administration failed to give Mr. Davis the over-all power which he must have but he is not even consulted on vital matters. I was shocked to learn that the roll-back of meat and butter prices was put into effect without any consultation with the Food Administration. This program vitally affects both prices and production.

Unless some competent man is given the power to handle all phases of the food problem, this Nation, with its vast resources, will go hungry before many months are over. Congress cannot absolve itself of responsibility by saying the Executive is at fault. It is our obligation to act and to act now by setting up a real Food Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two articles by Malcolm W. Bingay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address on War, Peace, and Education by Dean H. H. Schroeder, of the Illinois State Normal University, my alma mater.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 15 minutes this afternoon at the conclusion of other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this Washington Post happens to be the purveyor of the filth concocted by one Drew Pearson, whom I denounce as a filthy and cowardly villain, a venomous slanderer, and an insinuating rogue, who makes his living in the blackening of other men's reputations and the practice of blackmail blackguardism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Governor of South Dakota on the future of the Missouri Valley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter he has received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] be granted an indefinite leave of absence on account of a death in the family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article and a short quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem by Attorney Harold J. Wilson, of Burlington, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CONNALLY-SMITH BILL AND THE
A. F. OF L.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of the A. F. of L. official publication, American Federationist, on page 6 announced that it intended to defeat

for Congress all those who voted for the Connally-Smith bill. The statement reads:

Regardless of whether it is killed or adopted, we shall endeavor to vote out of office any Member of Congress who supports it.

Now the A. F. of L. has asked the President to veto that bill. I wish some labor spokesman would advise me whether, if the President signs that bill, the A. F. of L. is going to give him the same dose it promised Congressmen who voted for the bill. Will Mr. Green, Mr. Murray, and Mr. Whitney throw their political strength against the President to keep him from a fourth term? Do they intend to support the President if he signs the bill but oppose Congressmen who voted for it?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say that the propaganda that is being put out denouncing Congressmen for their patriotic vote is inspiring this coal strike that is now paralyzing our war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, considering post-war planning, I have obtained a copy of the Keynes plan for international trade stabilization, and also the Morgenthau plan, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include them. I have an estimate that the cost will be \$403.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a Flag Day address by William E. Leahy of the Washington Lodge of Elks. I am advised that this will cost \$56.25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committees:

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
The Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith desire to resign from membership on the following committees:

Census, Education, Election No. 1, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and Revision of Laws.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF
1940

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 1291, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. HARNES of Indiana objected.

ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL FROM EXECUTIVE
BRANCH TO CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL
COMMITTEES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2468, authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART, Mr. WEST, and Mr. BENDER objected.

ABSENTEEISM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2553) directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearing house for information on methods to control absenteeism.

Mr. STEWART, Mr. WEST, and Mr. HOFFMAN objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

REDUCTION IN COURSE OF INSTRUCTION,
NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 879) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy, approved June 3, 1941."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy" approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That until the termination of the present war, and until 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to reduce the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy from 4 to 3 years and thereafter to graduate classes which have completed such reduced course of instruction."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

QUARTERS AND SUBSISTENCE,
MIDSHIPMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2629) to provide an allowance for quarters and

subsistence for midshipmen in the Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That midshipmen of the Naval Reserve, when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind, shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted by law and regulations to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind.

With the following committee amendment:

That the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), is hereby amended by adding after the period at the end thereof the following:

"Midshipmen of the Naval Reserve when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted hereunder to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is an identical Senate bill, 1067, on the Speaker's desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), is hereby amended by adding after the period at the end thereof the following:

"Midshipmen of the Naval Reserve when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted hereunder to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 2629, was laid on the table.

UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2703) to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pensions, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I think this bill is improperly reported from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is not this one of the bills on which arrangements have been made to call it up by suspension at the end of the call of the Calendar?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The Chair's information is that the gentleman from Mississippi has consulted the Speaker with that in view.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PHARMACY CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 997) to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the medical department of the Regular Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of the first paragraph of section 10 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out "the Medical Administrative Corps" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Pharmacy Corps."

(b) The second sentence of the first paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The number of officers of the Medical Corps shall be 1,424, and of the Pharmacy Corps, 72."

(c) The second sentence of the second paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "An officer of the Pharmacy Corps shall be promoted to the grade of first lieutenant after 3 years' service, to the grade of captain after 6 years' service, to the grade of major after 12 years' service, to the grade of lieutenant colonel after 20 years' service, and to the grade of colonel after 26 years' service."

(d) The last sentence of the third paragraph of section 10 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For purposes of future promotion, any person so appointed in the Medical or Dental Corps shall be considered as having had, on the date of appointment, service equal to that of the junior officer of his grade and corps now in the Regular Army; and in the Veterinary or Pharmacy Corps sufficient service to bring him to his grade under the rules established in this section."

SEC. 2. The last two sentences of section 24 (c) of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, are amended to read as follows: "Existing laws providing for the examination of officers for promotion are hereby repealed, except those relating to physical examination, which shall continue to be required for promotion to all grades below that of brigadier general, and except also those governing the examination of officers of the Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Corps. Officers of said four corps shall be examined in accordance with laws governing examination of officers of the Medical Corps."

SEC. 3. The fourth sentence of section 24 (e) of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Appointments in the Pharmacy Corps shall be made in the grade of second lieutenant from pharmacists between ages of 21 and 32 years who are graduates of recognized schools or colleges of pharmacy requiring four years of instruction for graduation, under such regulations and after such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe."

SEC. 4. The first and second provisos of section 47 (c) of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, are amended to read as follows: "Provided, That any medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student may be admitted to a Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, or Veterinary Corps unit of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for a course of train-

ing at the rate of 90 hours of instruction per annum for the four college years, and if at the end of two years of such training he has been selected by the professor of military science and tactics and the head of the institution for advanced training, and has agreed in writing to continue in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for the remainder of his course at the institution, and has agreed in writing to pursue the course in camp training prescribed by the Secretary of War, he may be furnished, at the expense of the United States, with commutation of subsistence at such rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as may be fixed by the Secretary of War, during the remainder of his service in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, not exceeding two years: *Provided further,* That any Reserve Officer who is also a medical, dental, pharmacy, or veterinary student may be admitted to such Medical, Dental, Pharmacy, or Veterinary Corps unit for such training, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 3, strike out the words "second sentence" and insert in lieu thereof "third sentence."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "24 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "24c."

On page 3, line 6, strike out "24 (e)" and insert in lieu thereof "24e."

On page 3, line 15, strike out "47 (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "47c."

On page 4, line 14, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon, and insert a period after the quotation marks.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PRESENTATION OF HOSPITAL TO ST. LAWRENCE, NEWFOUNDLAND

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 118, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct, and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy.

Mr. PRIEST, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. GERLACH objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

MARINE BAND AT MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2683) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., from September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such convention, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$8,137.40, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this

Act: *Provided*, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Marine Band be allowed not to exceed \$5 per day each for additional living expenses while on duty, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which they would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EQUALIZING DISABILITY BENEFITS, UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 219) to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to explain the bill, so that the House may understand the matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to equalize retirement benefits that might accrue to officers in the service, as among the various components. In that connection let me say that if those who are commissioned in the Army of the United States should be disabled in line of duty, they would be retired in the grade they had attained, but not so with the National Guard officers and Reserve officers and Regular Army officers. All of those officers holding a permanent rank in wartime are promoted only to a temporary rank, and if they are injured in line of duty, so that they must be retired, they are, under present law, retired in their permanent rank rather than in the temporary rank to which they have been promoted.

Let me give you an example. If General Eisenhower, who is a full four-star general, and Maj. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle and Lieutenant General Knudsen and Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault should be flying together in a plane or traveling in an automobile together, and all of them should become disabled in the same accident, they would be retired in this manner: The full four-star general, Eisenhower, would be retired as a lieutenant colonel, because that is the rank that he holds. Maj. Gen. Jimmy Doolittle would be retired as a major, because that is his permanent rank. Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault would be retired as a captain, because that is his permanent rank. Lieutenant General Knudsen would be retired as a lieutenant general, because his appointment is in the Army of the United States. Therefore, of the four he would be the only one to enjoy that benefit.

I might give you one more example which will illustrate what would happen. The commanding officer of the Air Transport Service is Major General George, who holds as permanent rank that of lieutenant colonel. Serving under him is Brig. Gen. C. R. Smith, who was president of the American Air Lines and who was appointed directly into the Army of the United States. If those two officers should be injured, the brigadier general, who is serving under the major general, would be retired as a brigadier general, whereas the major general

would be retired in his permanent rank of lieutenant colonel.

Such discrepancies exist all through the service under the law as it now stands. The purpose of this bill is to correct that situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I give another illustration? This was furnished me by the War Department. Take the case of officers serving as majors, under temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, each of whom holds a permanent commission as first lieutenant in his component. For example, a Regular, Reserve, or National Guard, who was originally appointed as a first lieutenant from civilian life under Public Law No. 252, the Regular, Reserve, and National Guard men would be entitled to receive only 75 percent of the pay of a first lieutenant. We will assume they all had the rank of a major. They would only receive 75 percent of the pay of a first lieutenant, while the person appointed from civilian life or from an officers' candidate school would be entitled to receive 75 percent of the pay of a major. Should there have been a fifth officer who was thus injured and who was a retired first lieutenant but was serving at the time under temporary appointment as a major, he would not be entitled to any additional compensation by reason of the injury, and would be returned to a retired status with the regular pay of first lieutenant.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the bill relate only to retirement for disability incurred in line of duty?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Does it make any provision to take care of officers who have been wounded during the present war prior to the date of the enactment of the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does. It does not allow any benefits to accrue prior to the date of enactment, but it does take care of every such case and will allow benefits to start as of the date of the enactment of this bill in cases that have developed prior to enactment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not true that under the law an enlisted man who receives injuries in line of duty does not get retired but receives benefit payments? And is it not further true that such an enlisted man must submit himself to physical examination at any time the Government sees fit to question whether his injuries still exist in an incapacitating degree or not? As to these officers do you not propose to retire them and let them engage in any business under the sun, let them draw their higher rate of retirement, without any possibility of examination at any later date? No matter what happened to them, they still remain on the Government pay roll and engage in private business, make any amount of money they can, and if they

completely recover they can still draw this pay, can they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is my understanding that as far as the continuation of the physical disability is concerned, the same law applies to the officers as does to the enlisted men, and that in either event they are allowed to follow such civilian pursuits as they see fit.

Mr. POAGE. You say the same law applies to them. Maybe I am wrong. I ask for information. Are the officers involved to receive compensation benefits under this bill for their injuries or are they to receive retirement pay?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said the same law applies as far as continuation of the disability is concerned.

Mr. POAGE. Do you mean the retirement may be terminated at any time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not certain, but that is my understanding.

Mr. POAGE. I think the gentleman is wrong. I think the retirement cannot be terminated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are not setting up any new retirement laws. We are simply equalizing the law which is on the books today.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not correct that this bill extends to various components of the Army the same privileges as are now enjoyed by naval officers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Naval officers already enjoy these benefits, exactly.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that retirement for age cannot be terminated, but retirement for disability may be terminated when the disability ceases?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment which I intend to offer. In view of the situation, I think it would be more proper to have my amendment taken up in a separate bill, and I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have been asked to ask some questions with reference to the retirement features of this bill. Under this bill a Regular Army officer receives one type of retirement and a Reserve officer receives a different type. Is that not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only to a certain extent. I do not think it is quite right to say that they receive a different type of retirement. There are few differences that arise from the fact that a civilian officer is only in for the duration of the war, whereas a Regular officer is a career officer, and the only difference is that the career officer has the benefit of a retired officer in that he may trade at the commissary and he may trade at the post exchange, and be treated in an Army hospital, whereas the civilian officer cannot do so.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it correct that the Regular Army officer is put on one retired list and the Reserve officer or the National Guard officer is put on another retired list?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Although both officers may have been injured, as the gentleman has just illustrated, in the same action, and both may receive substantially the same type of injury, and both may be subject to the same circumstances, as far as is possible in receiving and sustaining an injury, but they are kept on different retired lists. I would like for the gentleman to explain why this is the case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Just as I tried to explain, the Regular officer goes into the Army to make a career out of it, and as a part of his compensation he takes into consideration these benefits that will come to him by reason of his service. For instance, he knows that in the future sometime he is going to be given the right of retirement, and when he is permitted to retire he will have the right to trade at the commissary, at the post exchange, and the right to receive hospital treatment in Army hospitals, a right that is going to continue. Whereas you and I, if we go in as civilian officers, go in simply for the duration of the war, without expecting to make a career of the service, but so far as the actual retirement pay is concerned it is under this bill the same for officers of the same rank regardless in what component they serve.

Mr. BROOKS. But the gentleman will realize this: That an officer retired ceases to be of service to the Army whether he be a Regular Army officer or a Reserve officer, if he is retired he is out of the service of the Army, although he suffers to the same extent from disability that the Regular Army officer suffers. Should there be any difference?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the gentleman raises a question that he knows troubled some of us in the subcommittee hearings, but I think it is a question that can be satisfactorily answered.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, there is an additional reason why a difference in status has to be made between the career officer and the temporary officer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; in that connection, the career officer can be recalled into active duty.

Mr. MAY. He is subject to recall at all times.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. And that difference ought to be kept in mind; that is the reason for having career men as well as temporary officers; otherwise it would be necessary to maintain a large army at all times.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. To my mind this is a very important bill, and I would like to

know whether it has been unanimously reported by the committee and whether hearings have been held on it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Hearings were held and the bill was unanimously reported; it is a bill that is requested by the War Department in order to even up these inequalities that exist today.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I see it, this bill proposes to equalize, to use a popular but less descriptive term than the plain word "increase," the retirement benefits payable to certain officers. However, according to its provisions I do not see how it equalizes these benefits, because, as the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee points out, the Federal Government can call back the Regular officers into active service, whereas there is no such opportunity to call back the Reserve officers who may have retired.

It seems to me, that if the purpose of the bill is to put them both in the same relative position then we should not attempt to pass a bill of this character and I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain how he reconciles the claim, that this bill would place all officers on the same basis with the very situation he described.

Mr. MAY. There is no difference except this one, which I think is the outstanding difference, that one man is a man who makes a career of the Army service; he is a soldier in the Army of the United States and subject to all kinds of orders at any time.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. MAY. Whereas the temporary officer is not.

Mr. POAGE. Then there is a difference between the two services, is there not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. But with the law as it stands now they cannot meet that condition.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. I do not quite understand how this is going to equalize the benefits.

Mr. MAY. The explanation for the bill was based on that very thing.

Mr. POAGE. What is the explanation? If a man, for instance, is a regular captain but is a temporary general and is injured, then he would be able to retire as a general rather than as a captain.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right if this bill becomes law, but not so as the law now stands.

Mr. POAGE. He simply has been given something extra when he was given the opportunity to occupy a position temporarily. He certainly could not complain. This bill seems to assume that the individual was injured by being given the temporary promotion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask this question: Suppose the gentleman himself has the rank of captain in the Regular Army but in this war is temporarily a lieutenant general. Suppose, for ex-

ample, that I came from private life into the Army with the rank of lieutenant general. Suppose further that the gentleman and I are in an airplane accident and both of us are injured. I will receive the retirement benefits a lieutenant general would be entitled to under the law, yet the gentleman from Texas holding the temporary rank of lieutenant general would get the retirement benefits of captain. Does the gentleman think that is what he would be entitled to?

Mr. POAGE. If there is any merit in our system of discriminating according to rank and of giving an officer greater retirement because he is injured than is given a private; if there is any merit in that kind of discriminatory system which we have operated under all through the history of the country then I would say the situation described by the majority leader would be equitable because under those circumstances I would have adjusted myself to the standard of a captain and my status of living would not have changed. The only reason in the world why there is a distinction between a private and a major, or lieutenant, or full general is simply because we have built up a social system under which the officer is at more expense and has established a more expensive standard of living than the private. The life of an officer is not worth any more than the life of the private, and the leg of an officer, if he loses it, is not any more valuable to him than the leg of a private. I do not contend that this bill establishes any new principle in this regard but it does continue an old practice which rests solely on the assumption that certain individuals have established a social standard and an economic standard that requires for its maintenance a higher retirement benefit or compensation payment than is required to maintain the economic standard to which someone else is accustomed. Now, if I have been a captain in the Army and had made that my vocation, then I have been living on the standard of a captain. If Mr. Knudsen has gone into the Army from an extremely highly paid position as lieutenant general, he, of course, has to maintain a higher economic standard than I; and Mr. Knudsen would be about the only person to whom the gentleman could refer because his is the only case I recall where a civilian has been taken into the Army as a lieutenant general. I do not contend that the system is sound. But if it is there would be no injustice as I see it in the situation described.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Army of the United States or of any component thereof, except an officer of the Regular Army, who incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade and becomes entitled to retirement pay because of such disability shall receive retirement pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade.

SEC. 2. Any officer of the Regular Army who heretofore or hereafter has been or may be retired for physical disability determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade shall have the rank and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade.

SEC. 3. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for an officer of such higher grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

SEC. 4. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon by reason of physical disability shall, if he incurs additional physical disability while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, be promoted on the retired list to such higher grade and receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War, or such person or persons as he may designate, shall find that the additional physical disability is incident to service while on active duty in the higher grade and not less than 30 percent permanent.

SEC. 5. Any officer of the Regular Army on the retired list who shall have been placed thereon for reasons other than physical disability shall, if he incurs physical disability while serving on active duty in the same grade as that held by him on the retired list, receive retired pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such grade retired on account of physical disability incident to the service.

SEC. 6. The benefits of this act shall apply to officers of the Army of the United States who were retired subsequent to April 6, 1917, or who may hereafter be retired for physical disability in line of duty in time of war or any emergency declared by the President, or within 6 months thereafter, determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade, including any officer given a temporary appointment in a higher grade under the act of June 16, 1936, who has been retired for physical disability in a lower grade.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this act shall not apply in any case unless proceedings to obtain the benefits provided herein are initiated within 6 months from the termination of the temporary appointment held at the time when the disability is incurred or the disabled officer's release from active duty, whichever occurs earlier: *Provided*, That such proceedings may be initiated within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act in any case where such termination of appointment, retirement, or release from active duty occurred prior to such approval. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to limit the power of the President under existing law, or to affect the right of any officer of the Regular Army to have the rank and retired pay of a higher grade than

herein provided, or of any other officer of the Army of the United States to have the retirement pay of a higher grade than herein provided, if entitled thereto under other provisions of law.

SEC. 9. No back pay shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act. The provisions of this act shall not otherwise affect the method in which officers are to be retired.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out lines 5 to 9, both inclusive, and substitute the following: "who heretofore or hereafter has been or may be granted retirement pay for physical disability determined or incurred while serving under a temporary appointment in a higher grade shall receive retirement pay computed as otherwise provided by law for officers of such higher grade."

Page 3, line 7, after the word "retired", insert "or granted retirement pay", and in line 8, after the word "retired", insert "or granted retirement pay."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an appropriate time to call attention to the very significant statement made a few days ago by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War. I consider his statement to be a startling one. He called the attention of the country to the fact that production in May of material for our Army and the armed forces which was scheduled to rise 2 percent over the April figure had actually declined 3½ percent, a difference of 5½ percent. What circumstances entered into this we do not know, but what they are should be looked into and if they can be made public should be made public. I express the personal hope that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House will look into this matter at once.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield gladly.

Mr. MAY. The House Committee on Military Affairs for the past 2 years has been accustomed to assembling in the War Department for conferences on the question of production and the progress of production and on the whole Army set-up. Such a meeting is scheduled for this coming Thursday. Regardless of that meeting or what it discloses, the House Committee on Military Affairs is very much interested in this statement of Judge Patterson who knows generally what he is talking about, who is reliable and truthful. If that is the condition we certainly will look into it and look into it at once.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to have the gentleman make that statement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Gladly.

Mr. RANKIN. It seems to me it is not necessary to go very far to find the cause of this slowing down in our war production if the gentleman will just read the papers. The coal strike is one of them, the dictatorship of John L. Lewis; the

others are strikes in our defense industries, one of which is in progress right now, if I am not mistaken, in one of the Ford plants in Detroit, Mich. As long as the Congress is not supported in its efforts to put a stop to these things they are going to continue, and our boys at the front are going to pay with their lives.

Mr. MAY. In connection with the strike in the Chrysler plant in Detroit, immediately when it took place and was in effect a day and a half, I made a telephone call, and I was told that that strike alone had reduced the Army plane production about 500 planes.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky says, but I think he is one strike behind the hounds, that he will find there is a foremen's strike in progress right now in one of the Ford plants manufacturing airplanes in Detroit. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that I think a mistake is being made in certain quarters by playing along with this thing now. We ought to outlaw these strikes, and we ought to let the American people know that we are not going to stand for them as long as this war is going on. I am informed there has been a 9,000-foremen walk-out in the Ford war-production plant up to the present moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. The statement of Under Secretary Patterson made such an impression upon me that I feel the matter should be looked into and I know the assurance of the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs will be carried out effectively and that the public will be advised insofar as the information can be given to the public. Personally, expressing my own views, this is no time for the letting down of production, neither is this any time for overconfidence. We have won some telling and effective victories, but the hard part is still ahead of us. The men at the front are possessed of confidence and determination to fight and win, but they know the dangers of overconfidence.

We on the civilian front must have that same spirit of confidence and determination to do our part, but we must also recognize the danger of our overconfidence.

Everything on the home front inconsistent with the maximum production of weapons of war, indifference among management or employees, unnecessary absenteeism, overconfidence, industrial disputes, lock-outs, strikes, suspension of work or stoppages of any kind must not be engaged in and will not be tolerated by the great majority of the people at home. There should be no one on the civilian front, as a matter of fact, who should tolerate or engage in such actions. One thing we must rest assured of and that is that such actions will be opposed and condemned by 100 percent of those who wear the uniform in this war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that nothing is more important at this critical hour than a discussion of the very ques-

tion raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. When the Assistant Secretary of War stated that our production of war materials had fallen off 5½ percent from what it was in a previous month, he was giving us sound, vital information upon which it is necessary for the Congress and the administration to act if we are going to win this war.

The administration is now reaping what it has sowed. I predicted when they put through the Walsh-Healey Act, when they passed the Wagner Act and rammed through the wages and hours bill, in violation of all logic and in disregard of everything for which both political parties and all political philosophers on whom we had ever relied have stood, we would come to the very show-down we now face.

In every community today the crepes are appearing on the doorknobs of homes of boys who are dying on every battlefield in the world. Every time there is a slow-down, whether it is dictated by John L. Lewis, Phil Murray, Bill Green, or anyone else, it deprives those boys of the weapons of war, and they pay for it with their lives.

The best paid laborers on the face of this earth are the men and women today who are working in war industries in America. Their pay is all out of line with that of the farmer or the soldier, all out of line with what such workers are receiving in other countries; and yet we find this wholesale coal strike that virtually paralyzes our war effort in a large number at least of the essential factories that are producing war materials. We find this week a strike of foremen in a Detroit aircraft plant at a time when the boys on Guadalcanal, the boys in north Africa, the boys on the high seas, who are going down in flaming seas of oil, and who cannot strike except at the enemy, are all suffering for want of the weapons of war these workers are supposed to be supplying.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will examine the hearings of the House Military Affairs Committee on the numerous bills we have had recently he will find that the foremen of the country are seeking to organize as an independent union which means that there will be nobody to bargain collectively.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; some of them want to take over the Government. That is the trouble with this bureaucracy, that is the trouble with certain exclusive labor organizations that are dominated by a few labor racketeers. The average member has no voice in the matter. I think it is about time we let them know that the American people are going to run this country through the Congress, the Senate and House of Representatives, and the President of the United States. They have threatened me with political destruction, but I want to say that one of the least punishments they could inflict on me, or on my country perhaps, would be to defeat me for reelection for Congress.

I am ready to meet the responsibility of wiping those laws from the statute books, if necessary, and putting teeth in legislation that will prohibit and prevent the slowing down of these war industries or any other industries supplying the material or the fuel necessary to carry these industries on. We cannot afford to lose this war.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for a very brief observation?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman recalls that several months ago I said on the floor of this House that we were already operating under a labor government that was rapidly running into a labor dictatorship which, if not stopped, would soon advance to the stage of despotism. We are now in the stage of dictatorship.

Mr. RANKIN. Some of the very same forces that are stirring up these strikes are stirring up race riots throughout the country. They seem determined that the American people must fight a race war, and a racketeers' war, at a time when we are taking every boy and every man available and sending them to the battle front. I am sorry the President did not sign the antistrike bill the day it struck his desk. I wish he would sign it now and put an end to the uncertainty. I regret that we could not make it stronger. The fate of America may be at stake in this controversy. The President should act now. Tomorrow may be too late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDERS PLACED BY ONE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT WITH ANOTHER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 972, to amend section 7 (c) of the Act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask either the sponsor of the bill or the chairman of the committee reporting it what the purpose of this bill is.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill provides that orders placed by one Government department or agency with another shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. It is requested by the Secretary of the Navy, as shown by the committee report.

I am advised that concretely the purpose of this bill is to provide that when the Navy, as it does, procures from the Army small arms and ammunition, as well as a large part of the field artillery used by the Marine Corps, it shall give the Army the same time in which to construct that equipment and deliver it as

the Navy would give if it made a contract directly with a contractor. In other words, this is to put the Army in the same position in the delivery under a contract with the Navy with respect to small arms that an independent contractor would be if the contract were made with the contractor rather than with the Army.

The Comptroller General has advised that the bill would give to the War Department and other governmental agencies the same latitude as to the availability of moneys set up in working funds as is now enjoyed by the Navy Department. The Navy Department advises that this bill should pass now because we are approaching the end of the fiscal year, and if it does not pass, many orders for small arms and ammunition, given to the Army, will have to be made over again, inasmuch as they will lapse with the close of the current year.

Mr. CASE. I have read the report as carefully as I could in the limited time available since the bill was called to my attention. It would appear that the bill seeks to extend the availability of funds appropriated to various Government agencies, and in particular, according to the explanation given in the report, it is intended to continue the availability indefinitely of appropriations made for the War Department. It is stated that the Navy Department already has this privilege, but the privilege does not extend to the funds of the War Department, yet the request for the bill comes from the Navy Department and there is no report of any request from the War Department.

It occurs to me that there is fundamentally a sound reason for a distinction between the making of funds permanently available to the Navy and to the Army, and that goes back to the constitutional provision that Congress shall have power to raise and support armies but that no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say to the gentleman that while, as I have stated, this bill comes to the Congress at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, the reason the request is made by the Navy is that it is the Navy that is primarily interested.

Mr. CASE. But apparently money of the Army or the War Department is involved and there is a basic question in the extension of availability to Army funds indefinitely.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will try my best to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CASE. In view of the fact that the request comes from the Navy Department to affect Army appropriations, in view of the fact that this legislation has not been called to the attention of the Appropriations Subcommittee which makes appropriations for the War Department, and in view of the fact that we specifically try to place limitations upon the availability of funds for the War Department, I am constrained to ask that the bill go over without prejudice at this time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman withhold his request temporarily

so that I may make this statement, and then the gentleman may pursue his course.

Mr. CASE. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say to the gentleman that the Navy Department informed me and the committee which considered the bill that this request was made by the Navy Department primarily because the Navy Department is affected. The Navy Department already has the power that it requests the Army be given in this case. It does not affect the Army except as to orders placed with the Army by the Navy Department, and I am advised that such is its purpose.

This bill does not propose to extend the time for contracts indefinitely. The bill, as it states on its face, only proposes to extend the time as the Navy now has the time to get its contracts performed by private contractors. As it states, the bill provides that orders placed by one Government department or agency with another shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. It further provides that, and I quote from the bill:

Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury.

I am advised and I have before me a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the effect that the reason it is imperative that the bill be passed as promptly as possible is to utilize the remaining days of the fiscal year to clear those transactions that still remain to be completed between the Army and the Navy, involving among other transactions the arms and munitions to which I have referred, consisting of small arms, cannon, and ammunition, for which the Navy makes contracts with the Army because the Army manufactures those arms, these contracts being made in an effort to avoid competition.

Mr. CASE. The bill apparently is intended to extend the availability of certain funds to the War Department. As a member of the committee which has placed certain limitations upon the availability of Army funds, I must ask that the bill go over without prejudice until we can have an opportunity to determine whether or not the War Department really wants this. There is nothing in the report to indicate their attitude.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I repeat that this bill does not involve War appropriations; it involves Navy appropriations.

Mr. CASE. On that point, then, I think the record should show that the report states:

As it now stands, the War Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the Navy Department on orders necessarily delayed.

Consequently, it would appear by the language in the report that funds of the War Department are involved.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is in error. The bill and the report as a whole show that only Navy appropriations are involved.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, GARRISON, N. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 650) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved February 10, 1932 (heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved February 14, 1933, June 12, 1934, May 24, 1935, June 5, 1936, June 16, 1938, and May 24, 1939), granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at or near Garrison, N. Dak., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "by", strike out "an act" and insert "acts."

Page 1, line 5, after "June 5, 1936," insert "March 24, 1937."

Page 2, line 4, after "within", strike out "1 year" and insert "2 years."

Page 2, line 5, after "within", strike out "three" and insert "four."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BROOKLYN CENTER, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2649) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn." (Public Law 525, 77th Cong.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved April 20, 1942, granting the consent of Congress to (or authorizing) the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided,* That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "(or authorizing)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled 'An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn.,' approved April 20, 1942."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL TERM, DISTRICT COURT, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1622) to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska, at Anchorage, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last paragraph of section 4 of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved March 2, 1921 (41 Stat. 1204, U. S. C., title 48, sec. 102; Compiled Laws of Alaska, 1933, sec. 1092), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"One general term of court shall be held each year at Juneau, and such additional terms at other places in the first division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Nome, and such additional terms at other places in the second division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Anchorage, and such additional terms at other places in the third division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Fairbanks, and such additional terms at other places in the fourth division as the Attorney General may direct. Each of the judges is authorized and directed to hold such special terms of court as may be necessary for the public welfare or for the dispatch of the business of the court at such times and places in their respective divisions as any of them, respectively, may deem expedient, or as the Attorney General may direct; and each shall have authority to employ interpreters and to make allowances for the necessary expenses of his court and to employ an official court stenographer at such compensation as shall be fixed by the Attorney General. At least 30 days' notice shall be given by the judge, or the clerk, of the time and place of holding the several terms of the court."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out "Attorney General" in lines 1, 4, 6, and 7, 9, and 14 and 15, and insert in lieu thereof in each instance "Judicial council for the ninth judicial circuit."

Page 2, in lines 18 and 19, strike out "Attorney General" and insert in lieu thereof "Director of the Administrative Office of the United States courts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

UNNECESSARY RENEWALS OF OATHS OF OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1206) to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments, approved August 14, 1937."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937 (50 Stat. 640), be amended to read as follows:

"That civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States and employees of the District of Columbia who, upon original appointment, have subscribed to the oath of office required by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes, shall not be required to renew the said oath because of any change in status so long as their services are continuous in the department or independent establishment in which employed or in the government of the District of Columbia, unless in the opinion of the head of the department or independent establishment or the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the public interests require such renewal."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

OYSTER GROWERS CLAIM AGAINST UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2614) to increase by 1 year the period within which certain oyster growers may file claims against the United States in the Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1935, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 13. That the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine claims for damages to oyster growers upon private or leased lands or bottoms arising from dredging operations and use of other machinery and equipment in making such improvements: *Provided*, That suits shall be instituted within 2 years after such operations shall have terminated."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY OF RETIRED OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 693) to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to entitle those officers of the Army retired between the dates of June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, and have not had less than 10 years' commissioned service, to

receive as retired pay 75 percent of their active-duty pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I notice in the report of the committee that the Budget Bureau is opposed to this bill, also the Navy Department. I think we ought to have an explanation from the author of the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct in his statement that the Navy Department did submit an unfavorable report, but if the gentleman will read it, he will see in the paragraph just preceding its objection that it says the bill does not affect in any way the Navy personnel. Therefore, I cannot see why the Navy Department objects to the bill.

Mr. KEAN. Why does it not include the Navy, but affects the Army only?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does affect the Army only. This relates to a small group of officers who retired between June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, in answer to a mandate carried in an appropriation bill, calling on the Army to reduce its officer personnel by a certain figure. The reduction had to be made by January 1, 1923. That is the reason that this particular period applies. The appropriation act was signed, I understand, on June 29, 1922, and the reduction was to come about by January 1, 1923. The Army used all kinds of persuasion to get those officers to retire. There are 70, about, or not over 70, probably not more than 50 officers left in this category, and their average age, I believe, is around 66 years. Every other officer who has retired either voluntarily or as a result of the class B board, and who has 10 years' service and World War service, has been given this benefit already. These are the only officers who have not been given this particular retirement benefit.

Mr. KEAN. What happened to the Navy officers who were retired owing to the Disarmament Conference in 1921?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know, but so far as I know no appropriation bill carried the mandate to the Navy to reduce its officer personnel.

Mr. BROOKS. When the pay bill was passed last year, it seems as though those are the only groups left out. This in effect is a report that includes this particular group by omission, because they were omitted on the list of the pay act last year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has answered one of my questions when he indicated why the dates June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, were included in the bill. May I ask why "not less than 10 years' commissioned service" is inserted?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know how that happened to be the original criterion, but it has been, and is, with reference to all these other World War officers who have been retired not less than 10 years. I believe, too, that under the

regular retirement laws, in order to get retirement pay, an officer must have had 10 years of active service.

Mr. COLE of New York. What danger is there that the passage of this bill may create a precedent under which, at the end of this war, we will extend to any Army officer who has had 10 years of service and who retires, the full 75 percent disability compensation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know that this bill would create a precedent, because we have had at least two, or perhaps three, before this, which have done the same thing as to the groups covered by those laws. Moreover, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in at least one of those measures we gave the same benefits to officers who had actually been retired by action of the B board. The officers covered by this bill were never before any B board. They came out in voluntary cooperation with the War Department, answering the mandate of Congress to reduce officer personnel.

Mr. COLE of New York. But is there not a very strict distinction between officers retired under B board operation? They were retired involuntarily.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. And these officers covered in this bill retired voluntarily.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But under every pressure the Army could bring upon them in order to reduce the officer personnel.

Mr. COLE of New York. But there was nothing in the law at that time that required them to retire. They were simply persuaded by the Army officials to do so?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Army was directed by Congress to retire their officer personnel down to a certain number, and naturally they encouraged every officer they could to do so.

Mr. COLE of New York. But none of these men was let out of the service or retired under compulsion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all, but we might say under duress.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to make sure that the passage of this bill will not establish a precedent by which officers or personnel of the Army or the Navy, at the end of this war, who may have served 10 years will come in and make claim for 75 percent retired compensation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see how it could.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942, is hereby amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"The retired pay of any officer of the Army retired between the dates of June 29, 1922, and January 1, 1923, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, who has not less than 10 years' commissioned service, shall be 75 percent of his active-duty pay."

SEC. 2. No back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue for any period prior to the enactment of this act as a result of the enactment of the foregoing amendment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAY STATUS OF WARRANT OFFICERS APPOINTED TO COMMISSIONED GRADES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2349, to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective as of December 7, 1941, the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States," approved September 22, 1941, is amended by inserting after the second proviso a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no warrant officer temporarily appointed as a commissioned officer under the authority of this act shall suffer any reduction in pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the time of such temporary appointment."

SEC. 2. No back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued prior to December 7, 1941, by reason of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASES IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2836, to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that this will cost \$5,000,000, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

POSTPONEMENT OF INDUCTION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1991, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (f) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended, to read as follows:

"(f) Any person 18 or 19 years of age who, while pursuing a course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning, is ordered to report for induction under this act during the last half of his academic year at such school or institution, shall, upon his request, have his induction under this act postponed until the end of such academic year, without regard to the date during the calendar year

on which such academic year ends: *Provided*, That this amendment shall not prevent any person who has begun his academic year since January 1, 1943, from being deferred until the end of the first half of his said academic year.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "while", insert the word "satisfactorily" and before the word "course", insert the word "normal."

On page 1, line 8, before the word "his" insert the words "one of", and add an "s" to the word "year."

On page 2 strike out everything following the word "ends" in line 3 and all of lines 4, 5, and 6, and insert in lieu thereof ", or until he ceases to perform satisfactorily such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier. The induction of any such person shall not be postponed under this subsection beyond the date which would constitute the end of his academic year if he continued to pursue satisfactorily such course of instruction."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRATUITY BENEFITS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2188, to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, but I understand there was some provision in the bill under which the War Department objected and proposed an amendment to be offered to remove those provisions from the bill. I reserve the right to object to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to explain it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The statement of the gentleman is correct and I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment that was prepared by the War Department, which, if adopted, will meet its objections to the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to know briefly what the bill will provide as amended?

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 2188, is intended to clarify and correct the interpretation of the existing law respecting the payment of gratuities to the beneficiaries of soldiers who die as the result of wounds or disease, not the result of his own misconduct, in the service.

The intent and purpose of the gratuity payments, under our existing law, was that the same should go to widow and/or children as dependents to bridge over the 6 months period following the death of the veteran, or if there was no child, or widow, then the same should be paid to dependent relatives, designated by the soldier, for the purpose of continuing the

support of the soldier for the period of 6 months, and until the dependent relative could, in a measure, rehabilitate himself or herself.

In the case of *Spotswood v. United States* (80 Court of Claims 836), decided March 4, 1935, the court decided that in the case of death of a beneficiary, after the death of the soldier, the gratuity payment vested in the estate of the deceased relative, and the same was subject to the payment of the debts and claims of creditors of such estate. That was not the intent of the Congress in passing such law.

The amendment here proposed does not disturb the existing law respecting the payment of the gratuity to the widow or children, if any, of the veteran. It merely provides that in the event the first beneficiary designated by the soldier dies prior to the payment of such gratuity by the Government, then the same shall not be paid to the representative of such estate, for the benefit of creditors, but the same shall be paid to the next beneficiary designated by the veteran, who shall take the same. This would merely give the interpretation to this law which was intended by the Congress.

In the *Spotswood* case, supra, in rendering the decision, the court said:

The right of action on such claim, in the absence of a provision to that effect in the statute creating it, is not abated by the death of the person having the claim, but passes it to his legal representative, who can prosecute it to judgment.

This amendment merely writes into the law the interpretation intended by the Congress, and the language which cures the ill suggested by the court.

I have a particular case in mind, which caused me to introduce this bill, which is as follows: Lt. Robert W. Carr, of the United States Air Corps, was killed when his plane fell on September 28, 1942. His death was in line of duty, and not the result of his own misconduct. His mother died prior to his death, and he was fully emancipated by his father. He lived with and contributed largely to the support of his grandparents both prior to his entry into the service, and after he was a member of the armed forces. This veteran named as his first beneficiary, James W. Arbuckle, his grandfather, and he named his grandmother, Julia Ann Arbuckle, as his second beneficiary, all as provided by the act of December 17, 1919. Thereafter, and on December 6, 1942, the grandfather, James W. Arbuckle, departed this life, leaving a very meager amount of property, but leaving numerous creditors whose claims would, if the gratuity payment should be made to his estate, many times absorb the entire estate, and leave the grandmother, who was named as the second beneficiary, penniless and destitute. The decision of the *Spotswood* case, supra, would make imperative the payment of the gratuity to the estate of James W. Arbuckle, and this Government money would go to pay his creditors. Under the amendment here offered, this gratuity would not be paid to the representative of an insolvent estate, but the same would be paid to the

next dependent relative named by the veteran to aid in the support of such person, as was intended by the passage of the original law.

An amendment will be offered by the Military Affairs Committee, which will clarify the language in the bill, and with which amendment I am in full accord. The language contained in such amendment which will be offered has the entire approval of the War Department.

It is my hope that this legislation will be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman from Indiana is to be congratulated on this bill and also the committee is to be congratulated on reporting it. I think it is a very constructive bill. I would like to ask one more question, however.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will be happy for my distinguished colleague from California to ask any question he may desire respecting this proposed legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I had a couple of cases of people who are now in the service where a man had failed to designate anybody as a beneficiary and I understand that under the present law his wife would automatically get the benefits.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct. The wife would be entitled to receive the gratuity payment, if living, and if there are living children they would receive the same in case of the wife's death.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But if he does not happen to be married his mother or his father or some other person is not now eligible unless they are specifically designated.

Am I correct about that; is that the purpose of the bill to correct that situation?

Mr. SPRINGER. This bill does not correct that situation. You are entirely correct in your assertion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana a question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman from Indiana complete his answer to my question.

Mr. SPRINGER. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from California that this bill does not correct that particular situation to which he has directed my attention. If a veteran is married, if he has a wife, or if he has children, then automatically the payments will go direct to them, but it is the duty of the soldier to designate the beneficiary of his kindred, as dependent relatives, and then the payments will be made to them in the absence of his having a wife and children, if they come within the requirements of the law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. But, as I understand, any debt made by the soldier, or incurred during his last illness, any unpaid debt incurred during his last illness,

and all funeral expenses, will be taken care of before the money is transferred to any other dependent?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I explain to my friend that gratuity payments do not go to the soldier, nor to his estate. Such payment goes to the dependents of the deceased soldier. After the money is paid by the War Department to the beneficiary, of course the beneficiary is in position to control it; it becomes a part of the estate of the beneficiary to be applied only for the support of the dependent. The intent and purpose of the gratuity payments is to take care of the dependents, who take under the law, or those designated by the veteran, who were dependent upon him prior to death, in order to bridge over the period of 6 months following such death by way of support and aid. Let us understand definitely that the gratuity payment does not go to the estate of the deceased soldier. The amendment which I have here offered is merely to prevent the payment of the gratuity into the estate of a deceased beneficiary, in which case the same may be used to pay the claims of creditors, and to compel the payment of the same to the next and subsequent named beneficiary, who is living and capable of taking the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That 41 Statute 367 (title 10, ch. 25, U. S. C., sec. 903) be amended by inserting at the end of section 903, aforesaid, the following language: "Provided further, That in event of the death of the widow of any officer or enlisted man, without children, and without unpaid debts incurred during last illness and funeral expenses, or in the event of the death of any other beneficiary named by the officer or enlisted man, prior to the payment of such gratuity by the Government, then the said gratuity shall be paid to any other beneficiary named by and related to the soldier, who is still living, in the order designated by him, who was dependent upon him: And provided further, That such gratuity payment shall not be made by the Government to any executor or administrator of a deceased dependent relative, as defined by law, for the benefit of the creditors of his or her estate."

Mr. SPARKMAN. I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the act entitled 'An act to provide for the payment of 6 months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct' (41 Stat. 367) approved December 17, 1919, as amended and supplemented (42 Stat. 1385; 45 Stat. 289; 55 Stat. 796; 10 U. S. C. 903, 903 A) be, and the same is hereby further amended by inserting at the end of section 903 a further proviso to read as follows: 'And provided further, That in the event of the death of any beneficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficiary of the amount authorized herein,

such gratuity shall be paid to the next living beneficiary in the order of succession above stated.

"2. Nothing herein shall be construed as to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments made prior to the date of the approval of this act, but no gratuity payment shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not like this amendment. The bill provides that, in the event of death, the widow of the officer or enlisted man without children and without unpaid debts incurred during his last illness, the funeral expenses, and so forth, "the money shall then be paid to the next beneficiary."

I do not think this amendment is a proper provision. There may be relatives in some other State, some distant State, or perhaps some foreign country, but certainly any debts for doctors' bills, medical bills incurred by the soldier during his last illness, and also all funeral expenses, ought to be paid before this money goes to the next-named beneficiary.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Why should not the amendment be amended to read that the money shall be distributed according to the laws of the State in which the soldier died?

Mr. RANKIN. I did not write the bill nor the amendment. I would agree to let the bill go through with that understanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman is construing the amendment wrong or else he is construing the law which is already on the statute books wrong. As the law stands the benefit is not drawn to take care of any debts that the soldier leaves. This does not take care of his last illness; it is nothing in the world but a bonus or gratuity that goes to a particular person designated by the soldier, provided such person falls within a certain classification. The soldier has the right to designate two such beneficiaries. The wife or child is automatically a beneficiary. Under the interpretation of the Comptroller General if the first beneficiary dies following the death of the soldier but before the payment of the money, the money must be paid to that beneficiary's estate to the absolute exclusion of the other living dependents. It does not matter how distressful their condition may be, under this ruling it must be paid to the estate of the first beneficiary. We in the committee felt that the other beneficiary who is equally dependent and who is living and who is in need ought to have the money rather than the estate of the person who has died.

Mr. RANKIN. I believe that the bill as first written provides:

Where an officer or enlisted man dies without children and without unpaid debts incurred during his last illness, and funeral expenses.

Of all things that we have tried to take care of in all veterans' legislation it was to provide for the soldier in his last illness and to provide for his funeral expenses. What assurance has he that his funeral expenses will be taken care of, or his hospital bill or his doctor's bill in his last illness? It might deprive him of that treatment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Who is deprived, the soldier?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; because this does not pertain to the soldier. This is not payable until after his death.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the point I am making.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is not payable until after his death; this is a gratuity to be paid to his living beneficiaries.

Mr. RANKIN. But this is to take care of his last illness and burial expenses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; not at all.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I misread the English language.

The bill reads as follows:

That 41 Statute 367 (title 10, ch. 25, U. S. C., sec. 903) be amended by inserting at the end of section 903, aforesaid, the following language: "Provided further, That in event of the death of the widow of any officer or enlisted man, without children, and without unpaid debts incurred during last illness and funeral expenses.

Does not that mean his own funeral expenses?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not one bit; this deals with his beneficiaries.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC ACROSS GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2912, to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill relates to the charging of tolls on the Golden Gate Bridge in the State of California.

It seems that at the time the bridge was constructed a permit from the Secretary of War was necessary since the two ends of the bridge rested on Government property. In granting that permit the Secretary of War reserved to himself the right to issue passes to whomever he might designate for free use of the bridge. During the years that have passed since the bridge was constructed that right on the part of the Secretary of War has been extended to such a great degree that now a substantial portion of the traffic passing over the bridge is Government people passing under free tickets given to them by the Secretary of War.

This bill would withdraw from the Secretary of War that privilege, but in with-

drawing it the bill reserves to the Government free passage for any military personnel, his own personal property, or any military equipment he might have with him. At first it seems to me that the reservation should also be extended to any Government-owned vehicle which might cross that bridge. After consultation, however, with the gentlemen from California [Mr. LEA, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. ROLPH], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], I now see a distinction between this bridge and other toll bridges over which the Congress has exercised some jurisdiction, and I therefore should like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] to explain a little more fully as to why the War Department should have the right to exempt from passage over this bridge its own vehicles.

Mr. LEA. The Golden Gate Bridge, as everyone knows, is one of the most outstanding bridges in the world. It was constructed entirely at the expense of the people of the political division of California which was created for that purpose. The Government did not pay one cent for the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge.

The Golden Gate Bridge has done much more for the Government than the Government has done for the bridge. There is, in my judgment, no reason why civilian Government traffic is entitled to free passage over this bridge. An effort was made to secure aid in financing the bridge through purchases of securities by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but aid, even to that extent, was refused.

The courts have recognized that the Federal Government has no right to free tolls over an intrastate bridge where it has contributed nothing to its construction. Ninety-one civilian agencies have sought a toll-free privilege over this bridge, but not one of them made any sacrifice or contribution to its construction.

It is true, aid to the construction of the bridge was given by the Secretary of War in granting a permit for the construction of a bridge, and the construction and maintenance of approach roads over the adjacent military reservations.

The construction of the bridge worked no hardship or sacrifice to the Government. It could have been located at no site to better serve the Government.

Each side of the entrance to the San Francisco Bay through the Golden Gate is lined with great forts. The bridge directly connects these forts. The Golden Gate Bridge furnishes a means of immediate movement of troops and supplies from one side of the bay to the other. The bridge contributes greatly to the mobility of troop movements and defense for the San Francisco Bay area. It has vast military value for the defense of the west coast.

The approach roads constructed by the bridge district, and the replacement of old structures on the reservation by new ones, cost the bridge district \$2,300,000. It provided the military reservations with much better roads than they ever had before. It provided six-lane boulevards instead of second- or third-class roads. The military personnel

were provided with side approaches without grade crossings to the approach roads and the bridge.

In addition to this, the permit properly enough provided that whenever the Secretary of War determines that military necessity requires it, he shall have a right "to take complete control over the bridge, and the roads herein authorized to be extended, and may regulate and control, or suspend, all traffic thereon."

The permit granted by the Secretary of War required that all Government traffic should have the toll-free privilege. It provided that all military and naval personnel, and their dependents, should have the toll-free privilege whether used in performance of duties to the military forces or otherwise. It is a broader toll-free privilege than has been required of any other bridge in the United States.

The bridge district had no option. It had to accept the terms of the permit or not construct the bridge.

Great abuse has attended the exercise of this toll-free privilege. Had this free traffic paid tolls it would have amounted to an average of over \$26,000 a year for the 6 years the bridge has operated. In several months during last year the toll-free vehicles enjoyed a privilege for which other like users of the bridge were paying over \$50,000 a month.

Over 2,000,000 vehicles have crossed the bridge without paying toll under the wide requirements of the permit. Thousands of persons have used the bridge who were not traveling on Government business but served only their own social and business purposes. The privileges of the permit have been shamefully abused.

This bill proposes to abolish the toll-free privilege so far as civilian traffic of the Government is concerned. It abolishes the toll-free privileges for dependents. It does propose a toll-free privilege for the Nation's military forces and for military traffic which moves in the performance of duty.

Under the proviso of this bill, H. R. 2912, exemption from tolls is granted to persons belonging or attached to the military forces. This provision is broad enough to include members of the military forces, as well as persons attached to them, who are required to pass over the bridge as part of the performance of their duties.

The military forces include not only the Army, the Navy, and the marines, but also, at the present time, the Coast Guard.

The privilege also extends to the conveyance, personal baggage, and the military property of the United States, in charge of persons within the exempted class. This provision would make one of the exempted class traveling on a common carrier, for instance, free from the toll but would not exempt the conveyance. An employee operating a vehicle transporting military property in the performance of his military duty would be exempt as well as the conveyance. One belonging or attached to the military forces merely traveling to and from his place of employment, or to or from his home, would not be in the perform-

ance of such military service, or entitled to the exemption.

The right to toll-free passage is, in any event, subject to the provision that an order for duty in the military forces of the United States be presented which requires a performance of such duty to pass over such bridge. Exemptions thus defined would not give the privilege to the dependents of military personnel, or those who are merely friends or guests of such personnel. The dominating thought of the exemption is that the toll-free privilege is given to those only who in the performance of their services for the military forces have the duty of so traveling over the bridge. In that case such person, and the property of the United States in his charge, are entitled to the toll-free privilege.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman tell the House that the total amount of this free Government traffic now totals 15 percent of the entire traffic on the bridge?

Mr. LEA. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who owns this bridge now?

Mr. LEA. It is publicly owned by the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District. That is a political subdivision.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whatever revenue comes in goes to some public agency out there?

Mr. LEA. Yes. There is not a cent of profit in it. The only object of this bridge is to give lower tolls to people who use it.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. The publicly owned Golden Gate Bridge was built during the depths of the depression at a cost of \$35,000,000 without one dollar of Government aid.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was a member of the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that made a study and had extensive hearings on this Lea bill to fix tolls for vehicles traveling over the Golden Gate Bridge. It is an intrastate bridge. The Federal Government has made no contribution to the cost of construction of that bridge. It is true that at both ends of the bridge it gave these political subdivisions, the Golden Gate Bridge Commission which represents the communities that are involved and furnished the money under legislative act, the necessary sites to build the bridge. In addition to that, of course, the bridge commission has spent millions and millions of dollars on access roads, and it has furnished more convenient egress and outgo from these various forts and military establishments out there.

I was on the Pacific coast investigating the housing problem and as a rep-

resentative of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I was asked personally to make an investigation of the toll situation on the Golden Gate Bridge. After spending some time on that bridge I was amazed to see the type of traffic that is deadheading over the bridge. The people of California and the people of the United States will never enjoy a free bridge if that condition continues to exist. I was informed by the officers in charge that it has gotten to a state where they are authorizing them to print 50,000 passes at a time in order that they may pass them out to anybody who they think may be entitled to use this intrastate bridge, which is controlled by a public body and paid for by the taxpayers of that State.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These as a rule are the families of men there in the service who are working in war plants in connection with this war, are they not?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Some of them are. Some of the people who are using the bridge; yes. There are many men who are using that bridge who work in defense plants, but they pay. I am talking about Government officials. There are 94 bureaus out there that are using the bridge, whereas on every other bridge in that State they have to pay a toll.

Mr. RANKIN. Do other citizens of that part of the country pay a toll on this bridge?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Everybody but these people?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. If it is necessary for these people to go across that bridge to carry on the work that is necessary to win this war and to defend Mississippi and California, does not the gentleman think they ought to pass over it without paying a toll?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. No; I do not think so. When they go by way of the Oakland Bridge, where the shipyards are located, they are obliged to pay a toll.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that his speech almost is reverse English from what we had when we tried to take the tolls off of the Cape Cod Canal. I am not much for toll bridges at all.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Neither am I. That is why I wanted to see this one eventually be free.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman talks about this bridge being built in the pit of the depression. Now, about these people crossing it, the reason the people are crossing the bridge is because of the war activity in that area; it is because of the activity that the war has inspired out there, which in turn has intensified the traffic. You will probably penalize the people to an extent that it will handicap them in the discharge of their duties for which they are sent to that remote section of the country.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will make an examination and investigation of this bill, he will find that it will penalize nobody but people from the other Government departments and bureaus and make them pay toll the same as if they were going over the Oakland bridge.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going at it that way, why do you not go at it in the same way as if you were coming in here with a bill for Government participation?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. This does give free passage for all Army, Navy, merchant marine, or Coast Guard personnel in any activity in which they happen to be engaged.

Mr. RANKIN. The chances are, I do not mind saying to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that that is an extreme danger zone. We need not deceive ourselves. We have a war in the Pacific, a very serious war. If this war should be brought to our shores, it will involve more than almost any other city in the country the city of San Francisco, and it will be necessary for the traffic across the Golden Gate Bridge to be intensified and multiplied many times. I think it is a bad time to bring up here a bill to impose a toll and restrict the use of that bridge, when that use is being brought about or increased as a result of the war activities.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that there are 91 nonmilitary agencies of this Government that use the bridge toll-free?

Mr. RANKIN. I cannot accept that.

Mr. WELCH. The language, the War Department grant, that permits the use of the bridge by these agencies was ambiguous, and not intended by the attorney for the Golden Gate Bridge.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. The toll-free privilege is not enjoyed by those who work for wages in these activities on either side of the bay. That is not the trouble. Primarily, the difficulty is with those who are going for their own social advantage.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from California that you can restrict that by holding down the issuance of the passes to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers.

Mr. LEA. This gives an exemption to all those who go across there as a military duty, both the traffic and the personnel. I call attention to the fact that the courts have decided that the Federal Government has no right to exact free toll of privately constructed bridges to which they do not contribute. To demand such a toll is a confiscation of property. These civilian agencies that are enjoying the free-toll privilege made no contribution whatever. There is a reason why the military forces should be given this privilege, because the Government could have some claim because the ends of the bridge rest on military

reservations, but there is no reason in the world why the Government should deadhead on a bridge that is built by the taxpayers of that particular State.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. LEA. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that request.

Mr. RANKIN. I want the bill to be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. DONDERO. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2936, to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the appropriation of \$200,000,000. I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] to explain the bill for the benefit of the House.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I understand that this bill is coming up later under a motion to suspend the rules. Can we not save time by having the explanation come then?

Mr. PRIEST. May I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he consulted the Speaker with reference to being recognized for the purpose of bringing this bill up under a suspension?

Mr. LANHAM. I have, and that permission has been granted. I was thinking that, if there was no objection, we might simply save that much time.

Mr. COLE of New York. I may say to the gentleman that in view of the amount of money that is involved, \$200,000,000, in spite of the fine explanation the gentleman might give, I would ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the bill goes over without prejudice, it can be called up under a suspension, of course; but if objection is made can the bill also be called up under a suspension?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. In either instance, can it not, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF COLE PIPE LINE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2520, to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the ninth section of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1945."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That section 8 (b) of the act entitled 'An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce,' approved July 30, 1941, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'but relief so granted by the President shall not in any case be for a period extending beyond 5 years after June 30, 1945.'"

"Sec. 2. Section 9 of such act is amended by striking out the date 'June 30, 1943' and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1945.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLLS OVER GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection to the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, that bill will be returned to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That tolls may be charged for the passage or transit over the Golden Gate Bridge of Government traffic, including military or naval personnel and their dependents and civilian employees of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business, but such tolls shall not be in excess of the tolls charged for the passage or transit of other traffic over such bridge: *Provided,* That any person belonging or attached to the military forces of the United States shall, together with his conveyance, personal baggage, and the military property of the United States in his charge, be allowed passage or transit over such bridge free of toll, if he presents an order for duty in the military forces of the United States which requires him in the performance of such duty to pass over such bridge.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point and include two short resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to compliment the committee for the painstaking manner in which it has gone into every phase of the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district, almost from the beginning, and for having favorably reported this bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Golden Gate Bridge is one of the engineering marvels of the modern age. Its magnitude and beauty are only surpassed by the majestic Golden Gate itself—that world-famous marine highway which connects the great Bay of San Francisco with the Pacific Ocean.

The Golden Gate Bridge had its official inception when I introduced the following resolution as a member of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco on November 12, 1918, which I prepared in collaboration with James H. Wilkins, long time mayor of San Rafael:

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco has been impressed by the discussion relative to the construction of a bridge across the Golden Gate by the Federal Government; and

Whereas it is evident that the construction of such a bridge would be of incalculable value to San Francisco by connecting it directly with the northern and central counties of the State and with the transcontinental railroad system; and

Whereas such a bridge would add a feature to the Bay of San Francisco without parallel in the world; and

Whereas it is a necessary step to determine by expert examination whether the project involves insurmountable engineering difficulties or prohibitive cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be urged to promote the necessary legislation providing for a preliminary survey and report with a view to determining whether the projected bridge is practicable or not. Adopted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, November 12, 1918.

Ayes: Supervisors Brandon, Deasy, Gallagher, Hayden, Hocks, Hynes, Kortick, Lahaney, McLeran, McSheehy, Mulvihill, Nelson, Schmitz, Suhr, Welch.

Absent: Supervisors Hilmer, Power, Wolfe.

J. S. DUNNIGAN,
Clerk.

Approved, San Francisco, November 13, 1918.

JAMES ROLPH, Jr.,
Mayor.

The passage of this resolution marked the beginning of a long uphill fight that tried the souls and patience of those men who pioneered the project. During the years immediately following, much opposition developed to the project because of the many differences of opinion which developed as to its feasibility, the selfish ferry interests which

held a monopoly on all bay transportation using this as their principal argument against its construction.

Nevertheless, there were those public-minded citizens who believed that the construction of the bridge was entirely feasible. They were supported in this view by such outstanding long-span bridge engineers as Ralph Modjeska, Joseph B. Strauss, and others, who maintained that the construction of a bridge across the Golden Gate was not only feasible, but that it could be built at a reasonable cost.

With the need for such a connecting link in the transportation facilities between the great empire to the north and the city of San Francisco constantly growing more important, a meeting of citizens was called in 1923 by Frank P. Doyle through the Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce. At this meeting I introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a citizens committee of five. This committee consisted of Joseph Hotchkiss, Frank L. Coombs, Capt. I. N. Hibbard, Frank P. Doyle, and myself.

In the months which followed, the citizens committee of five laid much of the groundwork which reached its culmination in the enactment of legislation by the California State Legislature creating the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district composed of San Francisco, Marin, Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, and Del Norte Counties.

In the meantime, the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, of which I was a member, continued its active participation in the project by adopting the following resolution which I also introduced, and which was approved on September 7, 1923:

Whereas the commercial, financial, and economic development of the State of California, and particularly the cities and counties located on and adjacent to San Francisco Bay, would be accelerated by the establishment of modern and rapid transit facilities; and

Whereas tentative plans have been prepared by J. B. Strauss, of Chicago, and M. M. O'Shaughnessy, chief engineer of the city and county of San Francisco, for the construction of a bridge connecting the city and county of San Francisco and Marin County across the Golden Gate, which plans are both practical and economical: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the War Department be respectfully petitioned to improve or correct, if necessary, the proposed plans for said bridge between the city and county of San Francisco and Marin County across the Golden Gate, and to order that a hearing be held in the near future, to determine whether or not said bridge would be a hindrance and obstacle to navigation in said waters.

Adopted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, September 4, 1923.

Ayes: Supervisors Bath, Colman, Deasy, Hayden, Hynes, McGregor, McSheehy, Morgan, Mulvihill, Powers, Robb, Rossi, Schmitz, Scott, Shannon, Welch, Wetmore—17.

Absent: Supervisor McLeran—1.

J. S. DUNNIGAN, Clerk.

Approved, San Francisco, September 7, 1923.

JAMES ROLPH, Jr., Mayor.

Because the bridge rests on Federal military reservations on either side of the Golden Gate and crosses navigable

waters, it was necessary to secure a grant from the War Department. In reaching its conclusions on the issuance of this grant, the War Department held exhaustive hearings before United States Army Engineers in the city of San Francisco, at which the strategic importance of such a bridge in national defense plans was demonstrated. It was pointed out that the large number of military and naval establishments in and around San Francisco at that time would be directly connected by the bridge and eliminate the use of the circuitous and antiquated ferry system, which required three-quarters of an hour as compared with less than 5 minutes by use of the bridge.

The important geographical and strategic location of San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay area to the security of this Government in the event of war in the Pacific and the fact that the bridge would bring the huge empire to the north of the Golden Gate into direct traffic communication with the great seaport city of San Francisco, were both emphasized. That high naval and military officials were aware of this importance is amply indicated by a statement made by Admiral Charles F. Hughes, while Chief of Naval Operations, in testifying before a congressional committee, when he said:

San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor of the cities that are on its shores. For its natural advantages and its location San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any extensive campaign in the Pacific.

Full justification of these early predictions are to be found in the fact that today San Francisco is the greatest port of embarkation in this country, if not in the entire world, and that the San Francisco Bay area is a literal beehive of military and naval activity. Within that area are to be found the Presidio Reservation, one of the largest in the country, which was established during the Spanish regime, Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Miley, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, Mare Island Navy Yard, Hamilton Field Bombing Base, other great airfields and military establishments at Sacramento and Stockton, the Sausalito shipyards, the great naval base at Hunters Point, as well as a host of other war industrial establishments. In addition, a large percentage of food supplies and materials necessary to sustain our forces on the Pacific are produced in the Sacramento, Napa, and Sonoma Valleys and in the great redwood empire. They are brought into San Francisco over the Golden Gate Bridge.

On December 20, 1924, the then Secretary of War, John W. Weeks, in a communication addressed to me as chairman of the commercial development and bridge committee of the board of supervisors, stated that the project met with the entire approval of the War Department. He instructed the proponent to proceed with their plans and advised them of the conditions under which this

approval was given and the permit granted.

Immediately following this the construction of the Golden Gate Bridge was assured, for the necessary State legislation was then enacted creating the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district. An election was held under the provisions of the laws of the State of California to provide a bond issue of \$35,000,000 to finance the project, which required a two-thirds majority favorable vote.

Because of the interest shown throughout the preliminary stages by Joseph B. Strauss in gratuitously furnishing his services, a contract was entered into appointing him as chief engineer. Associated with him at the express request of the bridge directorate, of which William P. Filmer was chairman, were Messrs. O. H. Ammann and Leon S. Moisseiff, world renowned bridge engineers, whose contributions were largely responsible for changing the design of the bridge from the ugly cantilever type originally proposed, to the graceful suspension bridge now spanning the Golden Gate.

And in that connection, Mr. Speaker, I may be forgiven for my pardonable pride in having been directly associated with the Golden Gate Bridge from its inception, both as a member of the original citizens committee of five and officially as a director of the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district from its creation to the present time.

The value of the Golden Gate Bridge to national defense is further demonstrated by the fact that practically all north and south troop and supply movements along the entire Pacific coast pass over the bridge to save the time which would be lost by the use of a long-since-outmoded privately owned ferry system. The value of the time-saving bridge would be incalculable in the event of an attempted invasion at any point along the Pacific coast.

As I have already stated, this great bridge is one of the engineering marvels of modern times. It is the longest single clear-span bridge in the world, being 4,200 feet in length. It is 700 feet longer than the George Washington Memorial Bridge, which crosses the Hudson River. The towers, which support 36-inch cables, carry the full weight of the bridge span and are 746 feet above mean high water, or approximately 200 feet higher than the Washington Monument here in the Nation's Capital. These 36-inch cables contain approximately 80,000 miles of wire and were woven in place on the bridge at the rate of 173 tons of wire per day. The vertical load on each pier is 164,800,000 pounds, and they are sunk into bedrock. Their great size can probably be appreciated to some extent by a description of the south pier at the San Francisco end of the bridge. Its depth extends from 44 feet above to 100 feet below the water level, its base area is 80 feet by 160 feet, while its top area is 65 feet by 140 feet, and it contains 152,311 cubic yards of concrete.

This magnificent structure was built during the depth of the depression and

without a single dollar of Government aid, and it marks the triumph of public enterprise so well demonstrated by the city of San Francisco and her sister counties to the north.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, It was my privilege to accompany the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative HOLMES, when he inspected the Golden Gate Bridge. On behalf of the people of my district I thank him for his generous and complete report of the Government toll situation as it actually exists. I thank him for his remarks today.

The military and naval forces on official business will continue to pass over toll free. This is as it should be. For 90 different Government agencies to use this bridge toll free has been an abuse of every idea in the original permit. The distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has unanimously passed H. R. 2912 and I trust the House itself will do likewise. It is in the interest of fair play to the taxpayers of the highway district.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, responding to the inquiry raised by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] I want to point out that the Golden Gate Bridge, on each end, rests on property of the United States. This land was paid for and vast damages were paid to the National Government for the moving of certain buildings, the buildings still being intact and usable by the Government. While the bridge has been tremendously useful to the Nation during this war, not 1 cent of its cost was paid by the Federal Government. All the money came or will come out of the tolls collected or the taxes levied by the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district. It is only reasonable and fair that everything but military traffic should pay its way, when riding over the bridge. Ninety or more Governmental agencies, relations of military personnel, and others are now using this bridge free. This bill only provides that the traffic of that kind pay the toll the same as any citizen who uses the bridge.

Thank God that the citizens of this bridge district had the courage and the vision to build this bridge, which would be invaluable in the event of any attack on the San Francisco Bay area. They built it and are going to pay for it and all they ask is that "deadhead traffic," never dreamed of when the permit was granted, pay its way.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on H. R. 2183.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 7 (c) OF ACT OF MAY 21, 1920, AS AMENDED

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 972) to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 972, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (c) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes", approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Orders placed as provided in subsection (a) shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury."

Sec. 2. Section 8 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1648), is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. This bill provides that orders placed by one Government department or agency with another shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. It does not involve Army appropriations, but only Navy appropriations, so far as the armed services are concerned. It is a Senate bill. The bill amends section 7 (c) of an act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), so that it will read as follows:

"(c) Orders placed as provided in subsection (a) shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury."

Section 2 of the act of June 22, 1936, is hereby repealed.

This bill was passed upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, as shown by a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives dated April 5, 1942, which letter is incorporated in the hearings of the House Committee on Expendi-

tures, to which this bill was referred. During the afternoon this bill was called on the Consent Calendar and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] called my attention to the following language in the House committee report:

As it now stands, the War Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the Navy Department on orders necessarily delayed.

That is a typographical error. That language should read:

As it now stands, the Navy Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the War Department on orders necessarily delayed.

The report was gone over carefully and I am unable to say whether the typographical error was my own, or whether it was an error in the printing, but the report followed similar language in the said letter of the Secretary. It had not been called to my attention previously. It is an error, and I am correcting it now. The bill itself shows, and the report of the committee as well as the hearings in the Senate and the hearings in the House, that the purpose of this bill is to enable the Navy Department, without competing with the War Department, to procure from and give orders to the War Department for small arms, small arms ammunition, and a large part of field artillery used by the Marine Corps.

Due to the inability of the War Department to obligate Navy funds allocated to it for the purchase of small arms in the same manner that the Navy obligates funds to a private concern, the War Department is unable to handle Navy contracts efficiently in all cases.

The purpose of this bill is to place the Army on the same status that a private contractor is placed. Under existing law, if the Navy Department gives orders for arms and for guns to a private contractor, the question would not arise and those funds would be available not only for the fiscal year but for a period of 2 years. My understanding is that in general, under existing law, money that is appropriated by Congress must be obligated before the end of the fiscal year and payments must be completed within 2 years thereafter. Unless the funds are obligated before the end of the fiscal year, the authority to obligate those funds will lapse, and unless payments are made within 2 years, the moneys appropriated will revert to the surplus fund of the Treasury.

Unfortunately that has not been true with respect to contracts placed by the Navy Department with the Army Department. The purpose of the bill is to provide that orders placed by one Government agency or department with another shall be considered as obligations, as set forth in the report of the committee, and to place those contracts made by the Navy Department with the Army Department upon the same basis as if the Navy Department had made a contract with a private contractor.

As stated in the report, the Comptroller General has advised that the bill would give to the War Department and to other governmental agencies the same latitude as to availability of moneys set up in working funds as is now enjoyed

by the Navy Department. The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department, with the approval of the Budget, and it has the approval of the Comptroller General.

I read in this connection from the letter of the Secretary of the Navy transmitting his request to the House. This letter is embraced in the report of the committee in both the House and the Senate, for the passage of this legislation:

While, as noted above, the Navy Department has authority under the act of June 2, 1937, to obligate its appropriations by such intergovernmental orders, the Navy Department is impeded in carrying out its program by the fact that the War Department does not have corresponding authority, so that the latter Department, through lapse of time, is debarred from paying the Navy Department on the orders necessarily delayed.

As I have stated, the report of the committee follows this language, but as I have also stated, the language is not correct and I might add is confusing. It is correct to say the Navy Department cannot pay the Army Department. The Army Department is debarred from making the contracts if they cannot be executed within a year.

I am advised by the Secretary of the Navy that this legislation is important because we are approaching the end of the fiscal year. It is important that the bill be passed as promptly as possible in order to utilize the remaining days of this fiscal year to clear those transactions that still remain to be completed between the Army and the Navy. The situation is more critical at this time than it would normally be, since it was as recent as March 31 that the Bureau received an additional \$1,000,000,000 in supplemental appropriations. The War Department, under existing circumstances, needs fully 30 days to process Navy orders, and this would concentrate the whole supplemental program into a space of less than 2 months. I am advised that the specific instances requiring passage of this legislation in order to prevent delay, to prevent duplication, to prevent competition between the Army and the Navy, involve Navy requisitions of June 22, 1942, \$2,047,000, and Navy requisitions of June 25, July 10, and July 30, all in 1942, involving large amounts of money.

Unless there be some questions by some Members of the House, I should like to say in conclusion that this bill was considered by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. It was referred properly to the Committee on Expenditures in the House. It is recommended, as stated by the Secretary of the Navy, and is necessary to enable the Secretary of the Navy to procure small arms, including cannon, used by the Marine Corps, from the War Department.

Unless there are some questions I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statements which have been made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] calling attention to the fact that the confusion in this bill arose over a misstatement in the report. I think the language which is in the report follows the language which is in the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, so that I think possibly the occasion for the confusion goes back further than the gentleman from Mississippi or the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am advised that is an error.

Mr. CASE. However, on the face of it, as the report came to us and as the bill came to us on the Consent Calendar, it would appear that we had legislation requested by the Navy Department, dealing with funds of the War Department. As a matter of fact, upon analysis, it appears that the truth is that these are funds of the Navy Department which it turns to the War Department to be deposited in a special fund to complete the procurement of certain ordnance items which the War Department buys for the Navy Department.

As has been stated, the Navy Department can get rid of its funds before the end of the fiscal year by placing a contract with private contractors. When those contracts are placed with the War Department, however, inhibitions of existing law would make the money lapse if not actually expended or obligated by the War Department before the end of the fiscal year.

I am going to go along with this legislation because of the war situation, but I do think attention should be called to the fact that section 2 of the bill before us repeals section 8 of the act approved June 22, 1936, for which there was a sound reason at the time it was passed. That section which is repealed reads as follows:

After June 30, 1936, advance payments under the provisions of title VI, part 2, of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933 shall have no longer period of availability for obligation than the appropriation from which said advance payments are made.

Certainly it is sound legislation that the Congress should provide that money should not be made available for expenditure indefinitely. On the face of it, the repeal of this section would indicate a tendency to repeal the prohibition against indefinite availability of funds.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am advised that the insertion of that section is necessary, and I am sympathetic with the gentleman's statement that funds ought to be returned promptly, any part that remains unexpended; but the Navy has that power now with respect to private contractors, and inasmuch as we are approaching the end of the fiscal year, while I am in agreement with the gentleman's statement personally, I think he is justified in going along with this bill, because it will take a great deal of time to get another bill started through the other body and back to this body. So I

think we can now take care of the subject matter by an amendment to the bill.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the statement the gentleman has made. I am calling attention to the repeal of this provision because I think, when Congress comes to revise some of the wartime legislation, this is one section to which attention should be given. I am not suggesting that under present conditions anyone would try to exploit it, but what this bill does is to create the possibility for the Navy Department, or any other branch of the Government to which it applies, when it comes to the end of the fiscal year, with a considerable balance of funds on its hands and not wanting to have that money revert and go back to the Treasury, to say, "Here, we have this money; is there any reason why we should not use it?" And then to place some new contracts, in order to obligate the money before the end of the year in order to capture any money that had not been actually expended.

I merely call attention to the fact that there might come a time under which such use of this legislation could be made.

Because of the present situation and our common understanding that demands for production are so heavy, and that it may be impossible to complete certain contracts in the few days before the end of the fiscal year, I am not opposing the bill. It would be unfortunate, with the war in progress, if the contracts could not be completed. But, Mr. Speaker, when we review wartime legislation, here is one piece of legislation that should be reviewed, and Congress, at that time, should reassert existing law, which provides that appropriations shall not be available for expenditure indefinitely.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I say that, of course, they do not have an indefinite period; the appropriations are carried over for an additional 2 years. Under the terms of this bill may I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that it is provided that funds shall be governed and obligations paid as now provided by law?

Mr. CASE. Yes, the appropriation can lapse in time if other law so provides, but it does remove the control of Congress over certain funds by extending their availability when otherwise they could not be used. Also, by repealing section 8 of the act of June 22, 1936, apparently it destroys limitations on the availability of other funds that might be in the hands of some agencies or departments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; but the funds would not be available under the section here, following the year in which they were appropriated. I was advised to that effect.

Mr. CASE. I hope the gentleman is correctly advised, but certainly the question having come up, that statement ought to be made a part of the legislative record on this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. And if the gentleman finds that there is any other matter which is not taken care of that

should be corrected, I will join him in making the correction.

Mr. CASE. I am sure the gentleman feels that way. Since in the War Department appropriation bill we carry a definite period of availability for funds, as a member of the subcommittee concerned with that bill I did not want this legislation to pass without calling attention to the fact that it should be reconsidered when we come to reviewing and revising or repealing wartime legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2936) to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended. The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 204 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$300,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$500,000,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker this bill relates to title II of the so-called War Defense Housing Act and authorizes an additional appropriation under that title.

Title II of this act does not have to do with housing as such but with public works and so-called community facilities within these areas where defense housing has been constructed under the act to the extent that housing is not otherwise available and cannot be supplied by private capital. Under title II funds are used for such things as extensions of water systems, sewerage systems, access roads, and additional school facilities as the need for such facilities

may be augmented by the in-migrant workers and their families, such additional hospitalization as may be approved arising from the same cause, and so forth.

In the authorizations which have heretofore emanated from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with reference to this act, the funds authorized under title II have equaled one-half of the funds authorized for the actual construction of the housing. The appropriations which have followed these authorizations have been in exactly the same ratio.

In the last Congress we appropriated \$600,000,000 for additional war housing of this character. No further authorization or appropriation has been made with reference to title II or the servicing of these war-housing projects in the respects which I have indicated, and this bill provides for an authorization of \$200,000,000, which is only one-third of the authorization and appropriation heretofore made for housing since there has been any authorization or appropriation for these public works or so-called community facilities.

Under title II at present there are \$175,000,000 worth of approved applications pending for which no funds are available, and there are many other applications not yet approved by reason of the fact that no money is available to meet the requested aid. These various facilities are scattered all over the United States in these various housing project areas, which are areas of congested defense industry where great numbers of in-migrant workers have been brought into the communities.

The committee was unanimous in its report on this bill. It realized the urgent necessity for this work to be done.

I should like now to afford an opportunity to anyone who wishes to make any inquiry with reference to it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas how much is included in this \$200,000,000 for public schools? And what part of the \$175,000,000 in applications on hand represents requests for public-school facilities?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot give the gentleman those figures accurately from memory, but I should like to tell him the nature of the funds that are distributed and allotted for educational purposes.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the gentleman in doing that if he will also explain to the House what the procedure is on the part of the Federal agency in granting funds for public school facilities?

Mr. LANHAM. I will. There is no purpose under this act to interfere in any way with the operation of any school where funds are made available by loan or grant in these various congested areas. The law specifically provides:

"No department or agency of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds have been or may be extended pur-

suant to this title, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this title relating to or any lease, grant, loan, or contribution made under this title to or on behalf of any such school prescribe or affect its administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials for instruction.

When these in-migrant workers are brought to one of these congested defense areas and it is necessary for this public housing to be constructed in order to provide them suitable living quarters which cannot be otherwise provided, there is by reason of the fact that many of them have taken their families with them quite an addition in many instances to the school population. There is no desire or purpose to have those children of in-migrant workers made a burden upon the communities into which they are taken. When a school is built within a war housing project itself for the accommodation of these children it is a temporary structure that is built by the Federal Government for that purpose. When an addition is necessary to an existing school within one of these areas then the addition is made to that school. There has been no controversy whatever with reference to the construction. The survey is made to determine what is necessary.

Then frequently, by reason of the number of children of these in-migrant workers being considerable, an additional teaching force is necessary. Those teachers are selected by the local authorities. Whenever an application is made for an addition to a school or for additional teachers under the provisions of this act a survey is made, consultation is had with the people of the local district or area, and they get together and determine what should be done to meet that local need.

Then the construction that is necessary is made in practically every instance by competitive bids through a contractor. There has been no controversy with reference to that feature of it. The money is paid to the local district authorities of the schools to pay for the additional teachers necessary. In other words, the Federal Works Agency does not in any way interfere with the operation or the curriculum or any of the other features of their normal school development.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman state that the funds which are herein authorized are to apply only in cases where the housing is built as temporary housing and may be removed?

Mr. LANHAM. No; because in some instances, and especially with reference to plants that will be continued perhaps in reduced operation after the war from the standpoint of our national defense, it is wiser policy to place an addition on an existing school which would not necessarily be temporary because there would be a permanent need for it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I mean, must the housing be of a temporary nature in order that the additional authorization for improvements contained in this bill

shall apply to that particular area. Is that the case?

Mr. LANHAM. No; not necessarily. If these in-migrant workers are brought in, they are the basis of the consideration. For instance, if the school population has been materially increased by the addition of the children of these in-migrant workers, although there might be available housing in the community for them, there would still be an additional burden upon the schools.

Mr. HINSHAW. As the gentleman knows, in the district which I represent, there is much additional housing that has been built for war workers and not through this particular agency. It has been done through the F. H. A.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do the funds authorized in this act apply to that type of condition; that is, for the improvement of the sewer system, schools, and so forth, in that kind of an area, or must it be solely the kind of area that has defense housing in it?

Mr. LANHAM. We are trying to look after these war areas from the standpoint of their needs. Of course, most of the housing to which the gentleman refers has come through the Federal Housing Authority under legislation emanating from the Banking and Currency Committee. I assume that perhaps in that law there is some provision with reference to that particular feature.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; there is not.

Mr. LANHAM. But we try through this act, insofar as we can, to meet these community facility needs which the war and the war industries have imposed upon these various communities.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly the question I want to ask because I have one of those areas that does not have any defense housing project in it, but nevertheless, it is built up with a great many new small homes that were built under F. H. A. to house war workers. What I want to know is, Do the funds authorized in this act apply to such necessary improvements as must be made in those particular districts?

Mr. LANHAM. Well, I am inclined to think that they would, although the provisions of this act were put in with special reference to this particular situation, but I should be glad to take that up with the administrative authorities to find out to what extent such provision is not in the Federal Housing Act.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it less fair to aid a community which has already aided itself than to aid a community that has not aided itself?

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, I am very anxious to see all these communities that have had burdens placed upon them by these migrant workers taken care of.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope that the gentleman will cause the law to be so amended that it may include an area such as I have described.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Further in reply to the gentleman from California, I believe

I am correct in the assertion that it is not necessary to have a housing project in order to participate in these funds. If it is an area where you have migration and it is caused by a war industry, whether or not you have a housing project you are eligible to the Federal Works Administration funds as set forth in this bill.

Mr. LANHAM. That is my interpretation because the whole basis of the consideration is the extra burden on the population caused by these in-migrant workers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to first make an observation, then ask a question. May I say that the gentleman has filled his promise to me when the original legislation was up that this would apply to school facilities. I recall that I asked that question at the time. I want to say, too, that the Federal Works Agency has done well in my State and I have no complaint to make except in reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, namely, To what extent are the local school authorities enlisted in the survey to determine these projects?

Mr. LANHAM. They are enlisted, they are consulted with reference to their needs. A survey is made by them, a survey is made by the Federal Works Agency, they get together, they determine their local needs, and they try to meet those needs.

Mr. MURDOCK. In other words, it is not someone in the community outside the school system, but the superintendent and his fellow workers?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct; the educational board that has control over the situation.

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope the Federal Works Agency carries out the matter as the gentleman has discussed it.

Mr. LANHAM. They have. I have heard some talk of a new directive that is going to change the rules and regulations. We had the general counsel of the Federal Works Agency come before our committee and he said there was no such directive and there was no such contemplated change in the rules and regulations.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Am I not correct in the assertion that there was not a single department head nor any of our local people back in our local areas that objected to this particular bill? We had no objections to it whatever.

Mr. LANHAM. There is no doubt about the necessity for this money. They have not had a penny since we appropriated the \$600,000,000 for the additional war housing.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is not going beyond the bounds of reason to say

that many school authorities in this country feel, and there is apprehension, that an effort is being made on the part of the powers that be in Washington to gain control of the public schools of this country. I believe that apprehension to be well founded.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to my friend that it was for that reason that in the original law we placed that provision I quoted, so that as far as this law is concerned it cannot be done. Under this act it cannot be done because all they can do is construct such additional buildings as may be necessary for the increased burden in the schools. Then as to the money that they supply for additional teaching force, the teachers are selected by the local authorities themselves.

Mr. DONDERO. What becomes of these school buildings after the emergency is over or at the end of the war?

Mr. LANHAM. This is purely a duration measure. The act itself provides that there shall be disposition at the end of the war of the property constructed under this act. With reference to the housing, such of it as was originally permanent, and some then had to be, although it is practically all temporary now, will be sold. The temporary housing will be sold or salvaged. These various sewer extensions, water extensions, and things of that kind, will be disposed of in these various cities or communities upon the best terms the Government can make, but they are now absolutely necessary for carrying on our war work.

Mr. DONDERO. Are these school buildings permanent in nature or are they simply temporary in nature?

Mr. LANHAM. They are usually temporary, especially where they are built within the housing project area itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas. He is doing a good job.

Mr. LANHAM. Sometimes there may be a community where there is a permanent plant like an airplane plant that will be carried on with reduced production after the war, and some in-migrant workers will still be there, which will make a permanent need. Under those circumstances it is frequently much better to put a permanent addition upon an existing school building than it is to build one that is merely temporary.

Mr. DONDERO. Do the Federal authorities that administer this Act cooperate with and through the State educational authorities in the various States, in addition to the local school boards?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, but the local school board, of course, and the Federal Works Agency are the best ones to determine what the existing war need is in a particular place. The war need in this regard is not general in any State, it is in these congested defense areas. For instance, with reference to sewerage, when they get their applications back to Washington, the agency gets the approval of

the Bureau of Public Health. When they get these applications back in school matters they consult the Office of Education.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman says that certain allocations are made. Are they made on the basis of the priorities available?

Mr. LANHAM. At first we did have some trouble with reference to priorities under this act, but we are assured by the War Production Board and by those who have the administrative control of this Act that those matters have all been settled and that they anticipate no further trouble in the matter of priorities for these essential war works.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is not that a very recent thing?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, relatively recent.

Mrs. BOLTON. If, on the other hand, there may be some allocations that have been made for which no priorities have been granted—

Mr. LANHAM. They would come under the recent decision, if they are still pending.

Mrs. BOLTON. But possibly some of the need for those approved and not having priorities has passed, so that there are allocations made for more money than is expendable.

Mr. LANHAM. There are at present \$175,000,000 approved applications.

Mrs. BOLTON. I know they are approved, but not on the basis of priorities.

Mr. LANHAM. They are approved on the basis of need, and we have been assured by the War Production Board that where that need exists they will get the priorities.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; but the priorities have not actually been gotten.

Mr. LANHAM. There has been no money to do the work. The applications are piling. They have scraped the bottom of the barrel and there have been no funds either authorized or appropriated under this title since we appropriated the \$600,000,000 for the housing.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; but some of those that were appropriated for have not had priorities, so that there could be a fund that is available for present use.

Mr. LANHAM. The authorities tell us they are out of funds and have all these applications pending.

Mrs. BOLTON. If some investigation were made, some funds might be available.

Mr. LANHAM. My belief is that they are going to find it very difficult to get along on the amount herein authorized.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What proportion of the \$200,000,000 carried in this bill will be used for services rather than for construction?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot give the gentleman, from memory, those exact proportions—they were presented to us in

the hearings—but necessarily quite a little bit of it goes for services. It goes for services in supplying teachers, for instance. It goes for services in supplying hospitals.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As chairman of the committee the gentleman surely has some information he can give the House as to this amount of money, and the proportion being used for services.

Mr. LANHAM. In a way it is all services, even the construction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not talking about the construction. I am talking about paying personnel for child welfare and for other matters.

Mr. LANHAM. I see now to what the gentleman is referring. With reference to these child welfare centers, in each of these communities where these immigrant workers come with their families, there are a great many young children whose parents are working in these war plants. A great many of the children are under school age; they cannot even attend school, and the parents could not work unless there was some supervision and care of their little children during the time they do work. So we have made provision for their care. However, their parents pay for all their food, and they pay for a good part of their supervisory care. There are some instances where they pay as high as 80 percent, and but for the fact we do that, these parents could not work in these war plants.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I still ask the gentleman from Texas how much of this money is going for operating expenses?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman means with reference to child care?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I mean altogether, for recreation, for child welfare, and everything else. How much is going into actual construction of the buildings?

Mr. LANHAM. Those figures are in the hearings and it may be that some other member of the committee may remember them accurately. But both the construction and the service are needed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Can the gentleman give me any idea?

Mr. LANHAM. Most of it, of course, is for construction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this bill is certainly in no shape to be passed under suspension of the rules. It involves \$200,000,000. We cannot find how much of it is for construction and how much is for nursing or child welfare or for recreational facilities or educational work that the Federal Works Agency is going to finance.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman might ascertain how much was spent out of the former \$600,000,000 appropriated for construction, and how much was actually used for other purposes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I could not find out anything; there are no hearings, but we find that \$175,000,000 of applications

have been approved, and we don't know by whom.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. No; I cannot yield. The gentleman can perhaps answer some of these questions in his own time. I don't know whether \$175,000,000 has been approved by the War Production Board or not. I understand that \$50,000,000 of the amount they still have has not been approved and will not be approved by the War Production Board. There is a \$400,000,000 bill for this same Federal Works Agency that is to come up before the Rules Committee tomorrow, and these two bills should be considered together, and under rules, where we would have some hearings and where we would have an opportunity to learn the facts and consider amendments and not be shoved through under suspension of the rules. I found out today that one board of education was offered \$4,700 by a Federal Works agent. They asked what for, and were told for child care, for taking care of children. The board then said that they took care of their own children without Federal help. And they were then asked whether they could not use the money anyhow, because it was available for them. I would like to know how many instances like that are going on. I found out to my amazement that these facilities, which as far as the figures here show go for not merely public utilities but for various kinds of welfare and recreational facilities, are available not only to communities that the Federal Works Agency have built, but in any other community where there is any war industry that needs help or can be persuaded to accept it. We have other Federal agencies—I do not know how many of them—that are attempting to come in and use local existing agencies. What we have here is obviously another attempt by a Federal bureau to take on a lot of activities that have nothing to do with its real business, the construction of buildings.

It seems to me that unless and until we can get the facts, and the hearings, and find out how much is approved for what and gear this in with the \$400,000,000, we had better not pass this bill. There is no attempt to give us the full facts. As to the proportions for various purposes we don't know. As to the educational facilities here is another example of where a Federal bureau comes in and says, yes, there is money for education: of course, we have nothing to do with the kind of education that you furnish, but you have to come to us for the money.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. There is nothing in the Lanham Act that has anything to do with education, only insofar as an emergency in connection with a war industry is concerned, at those school facilities.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Who determines this emergency?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. The local authorities, together with the Federal Works.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes; and unless the Federal Works says there is an emergency and that the money is to be used

for educational purposes, the community does not get it. That gives the agency control of the situation. What in the world has the Federal Works to do with education or with recreational matters, or with taking care of babies?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. The gentleman should get the whole picture. The gentleman should read the Lanham Act. The gentleman himself is referring to two different appropriations out of that act, and one is providing for school facilities, sewer mains, water mains, and even child care.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Child care under a Federal Works Agency.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. This provides facilities and has nothing to do with the care of children, but in industrial areas—

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In war areas, whether Federal Works has anything to do with the area or not?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. If it is a war emergency proposition they make a contribution, but they have nothing to do with the hiring of the help.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is the kind of thing I am trying to stop, contributions by rival agencies in the name of war emergencies, so as to perpetuate and expand the powers of the agencies, and paralyze local initiative and responsibility.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Ohio, and knowing his splendid record I am of the full realization that he has not read or carefully analyzed this bill, because this bill is simply enabling legislation giving \$200,000,000 to continue a program that my distinguished colleague voted for twice before and never raised his voice in objection.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply an extension of facilities. It does not include the construction of a single house. It takes care of schools, sewers, hospitals, and other facilities the need of which is caused by the immigration of labor and where the local community cannot stand the additional burden of the required additions.

The technique of those who oppose various legislation is changing, Mr. Speaker. The technique of some of the bureau heads who do not have their own way is changing. They used to come before our committee and set forth their argument—it seems as though the committee was a little tough on some of them and inquired into the operations of their particular department. Now, these department heads, or their assistants stay away from our committee and wait until the bill comes on the floor of Congress and then they call up their particular friends especially those from their own State and ask them to make certain speeches and give these friends certain figures which that particular bureau head cannot back up in any manner, shape or form. I know the gentle-

man who called my colleagues from Ohio, and he is a distinguished citizen of Ohio. I hope some of these days he will have the intestinal fortitude to come before our committee when he opposes certain legislation so that we can question him about some of the activities of the department which he heads. He wants to control part of this money. That is the whole story behind this opposition. This particular individual, in a policy-forming department, wants this money turned over to him so that he can promote himself into a job and take away from our local school people and local municipal officials the rights that they have under the Lanham Act.

There has been no one before our committee who opposed this bill. We have had extensive hearings. We gave this bureau head the right to come before us, but he did not appear. But he has certainly made the telephone wires buzz in the last 24 hours.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. Yes, I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. There are no hearings available to us to answer the questions and the chairman of the committee cannot answer them. He cannot answer these natural questions that come up when we try to find out how this money is being spent.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. LANHAM. Since reference has been made by my distinguished colleague to the fact that \$10,000,000 have been used for that purpose, the people to whom he refers wanted us to turn over \$20,000,000 to them to use as they pleased.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct; and that is the crux of this whole situation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In spite of all that has been said, do you not think that this Congress is still entitled to know how much money you have actually spent in the construction of buildings, how much money you have actually spent for public service, how much you contemplate spending out of this appropriation for construction, and how much you expect to spend for services?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman could get that information by picking up the telephone and asking the administrative authorities.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I cannot get it from the chairman of the committee that has held hearings on the floor, I do not believe I can get it from the gentlemen downtown. It is hard for me to understand the reticence that exists among the members of this committee. Why do you not want to tell the Congress what this is for?

Mr. LANHAM. I have nothing that I am withholding, nothing that I am not entirely willing to disclose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly, whether you are withholding it or not, we have not had the information.

Mr. LANHAM. I have just told you with reference to this matter where \$10,000,000 was spent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. You are talking about an entirely different matter. You are not talking about your own bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say that question on a few separate items was asked of our distinguished chairman on one particular bill. I might say to my distinguished colleague, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that if we were to ask him about all the details of every one of his bills that comes before us for consideration, we would have quite a time getting him to explain them. The hearings will show a complete break-down of all items—covering the money spent, and, I believe, a chart showing the contemplated expenditures. But remember, Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply for a continuation of a program that is now in progress of giving assistance to local districts who find they need money for schools, hospitals, extension of sewers, and other facilities—the need of which is caused by additional people coming into their district to participate in the war effort—and which they as a local unit cannot finance alone—and before this money is allocated or spent the local people are consulted and 90 cases out of 100—the request for this assistance comes from the local people. This money is not spent where it is not wanted—only when it is absolutely needed.

We have had no one appear before the committee in opposition to this bill. And, we had the absolute assurance that the local people will be taken into consideration on the educational situation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to ask the gentleman about one thing: I understand there has been no objection registered with the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS. My school administrator in my State tells me some of the administrative procedures under this original act have been unsatisfactory. We have been trying to get a hearing and I am asking for information about it. Have there not been registered with the committee protests on the part of educational administrators regarding this?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Some of the State superintendents wanted us to turn the money over to their educational funds. It is a temporary measure, for the duration of the war.

Title II involves matters with reference to the public schools, public roads, and many other governmental agencies. If these various functions under title II were turned over to these respective agencies, the cost of administration and the increase of personnel would be greatly enhanced. The investigations with reference to school needs have been made in the local communities by the local

school authorities and they have presented their allocations and there has been a survey by these local boards and by the Federal Works Agencies to determine these needs, and I think it can be truthfully stated that these local school boards have been generally well satisfied with the operation.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman sure of that? In other words, was he or not impressed with the soundness of the argument made by the State administrator and others that there will be made objections on the part of local administrators?

Mr. LANHAM. I was not, because this is merely a temporary provision for the duration and that is why it is being handled in this manner. We have not sought to make this a permanent law. Congress can pass on that independently when that question arises.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let me just make this statement. We have appropriated in the past \$1,200,000,000 for public housing, and I can appreciate what is needed in many parts of this country because I have personally made a very thorough inspection of the housing program. I am familiar with the operations of municipalities, and in connection with the increased construction of homes, whether it be public homes or private, in the war areas, that has certainly required an extension of public facilities, and that situation cannot be helped.

We have tried to keep the operations separate under the two Lanham acts, one of which deals distinctly with the Federal housing and the other distinctly with facilities in connection with the development of the housing program.

We did not give the Federal Works Administrator one cent when we increased the public housing appropriation \$600,000,000 last fall. There are pending in many of these war emergency areas today requests for additional sewer facilities, water facilities, hospital facilities; there are many units that must be provided in these communities. We must give the Federal Works Agency more money in order that they may continue to build these facilities that are very, very necessary to enjoy the benefits of the housing programs, and the money has been authorized for that kind of facilities.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to know where there might be available to the Members of Congress a statement as to the States in which this money has been spent that was previously appropriated and for what purposes.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I have a copy of that in my office. They were inserted in the hearings that we have held for the last 3 or 4 weeks. My impression was that the hearings have been printed and were ready for distribution.

Mr. BUSBEY. We can get that from the gentleman's office, then.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Yes. Regardless of what has been said, we are

not trying to build up through this medium of appropriation any other department of Government. When we get through with this emergency housing program we want to be in a position where we can liquidate and salvage whatever we can out of the money we have spent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the time of debate be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unanimous consent request could be submitted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of debate on this bill be extended for 10 minutes and that I be allotted 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the gentleman having 3 minutes but I should object to his request that debate be continued for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that debate on the bill be extended 10 minutes and he be allotted 3 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will modify his request to 3 minutes I will not object. We have another bill to be called up.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes on the pending bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have such confidence and faith in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which committee brings this bill to the House that what I am about to say is in no way to be taken as opposition to the bill or in criticism of the committee. The service of our able friend and colleague on the committees of this House and in this House is an important contribution to the legislative work of this Nation.

What I said a few minutes ago was that there was apprehension among school officials of many of the States of this Union that there was an indirect or subtle effort being made on the part of bureaus in the Federal Government to obtain control of the public school system of this country. That suspicion or apprehension is well founded. For example, all of us know that in another body a bill has already been introduced to provide a subsidy to the extent of \$300,000,000 annually, \$200,000,000 of which is to pay school teachers. If that is not an effort to gain control, political or otherwise, of the school system of this

country I do not know what is. Under the guise of war, social gains, and the extension of Federal aid, attempts are being made to gain control of public education. We all know that the war effort has created problems in many communities that the local units cannot solve. I come from such a community. Within sight of my home there has been constructed in the metropolitan area of Detroit the tank plant that is making the 28-ton tanks, the medium tanks, and also the naval arsenal making guns for the United States Navy. With the coming of these two factories, one of them erected in a cornfield, there came tremendous problems that local school boards, and local officials, could not solve without help. It is obvious that the Federal Government must step in and aid those communities. The bill before us has as its objective the providing of such aid. I am in favor of this measure and shall vote for it.

In supporting this bill I also insist that our public school system be kept under the control of our local and state authorities.

In the last 10 years a Federal colossus of 92 new agencies, boards, bureaus, and commissions have been established in the Nation's Capital. Confusion and chaos is the result and a growing resentment among the people. Let us be sure that by this legislation we do not add to the powers of any one of these bureaus, particularly the Federal Works Agency, in the administration of this act.

In this connection I call particular attention to the following letter I received from Dr. Eugene B. Elliott, superintendent of public instruction, Michigan:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Lansing, Mich., June 18, 1943.
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DONDERO: I understand a new bill appropriating funds for schools and other community facilities in war areas has been introduced in Congress.

The act which has been in effect since the start of the war has been known as Public Act 137, or the Lanham Act. Under this act we have had several school building and maintenance and operation projects in Michigan.

The Lanham Act wisely carries a provision which states that the operation of this act must in no way interfere with the administration, operation, or the instructional program in schools. While it seems that the Congress has made itself perfectly clear in the matter of school operation, nevertheless the act is administered by the Federal Works Agency, a noneducational agency, and we understand there is a recent directive to the effect that it will not be necessary for this agency to have certification of need from the State department or United States Office of Education for either school construction or maintenance and operation funds.

In other words, the procedure is something like this: a Federal Works Agency person makes direct contact with the school district, both in preparing the application for funds and subsequently delivering the checks in person to the school boards. Along with this, in some programs, there is a service audit by the Federal Works Agency, which means that it not only audits the funds but also the services rendered by the school district. It is our feeling that this kind of procedure will eventually affect administration, supervision, operation, and even the instruc-

tional programs in the schools. We therefore recommended that the act be further amended so that all funds for school construction, and maintenance, and operation be channeled through the United States Office of Education, and in turn through the State department of education. They are the legal and constitutional educational agencies.

These Lanham funds amount to less than 1 percent of our school operating funds and it seems entirely unnecessary and undesirable that a Federal engineering agency retain a separate staff to deal with school operation.

It is our hope that you will give this matter your very serious consideration because we feel that it is fundamental to State-Federal relationship.

Yours sincerely,

EUGENE B. ELLIOTT,
Superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, in previous legislation from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, enacted by this House and known as Public Act 137 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the Lanham Act, a provision was included to the effect that the operation of the act must in no way interfere with the functions of the public schools in the States. I urged that provision before that committee, and I am gratified that it was adopted by the Congress and made a part of the law of the country.

I am well aware that there are people in the Federal Government and perhaps some in the Federal Works Agency who desire to bypass and completely destroy that provision of the law by going into local school districts, through representatives of that Agency, make direct contact with local school boards, prepare applications for funds, make payments direct to the local school authorities in person, and completely ignore the State and county school officials. If the expansion of public-school facilities, authorized under this and previous legislation, either in the construction of additions to local school buildings or the erection of new buildings are to become a part of the school systems of the States, then certainly the county and State officials should be consulted as to the need and type of buildings to be constructed in the same manner as local school districts now have their school programs for school buildings approved by State authorities before they proceed. Such is the law in Michigan and undoubtedly is the law in many of the States of the Union.

The question may soon become an issue in this country whether or not the taxpayers want the control of their educational systems placed in the hands of some bureau or agency in Washington, a thousand or two thousand miles away, or whether those who down through the years have administered the needs of public education, the local school board, shall continue to function. That is the issue in a few words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from the superintendent of public instruction of Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill be passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANHAM) there were—ayes 63, noes 22.

So (two-thirds having voted in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of the legislative business in order for the day and any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] may be permitted to speak for 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday and Thursday next the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address by Edward R. Murrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS AFFECTING COMPENSATION, PENSIONS, AND RETIREMENT PAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2703) to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pensions, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, with amendments.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Pub-

lic Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and Veterans Regulations, as now or hereafter amended, shall be applicable to benefits provided under Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended; Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; and under laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as amended: *Provided*, That where solely as a result of the definition of the term "child" in paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series as amended by this act, the child or children of a deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection would be entitled to benefits under the general pension law or service-pension acts reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, the rates of service pension applicable to such child or children shall be those provided in Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as now or hereafter amended.

SEC. 2. Section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 450), is further amended by adding a new subsection (4) to read as follows:

"(4) Any benefit payable or paid by the Veterans' Administration shall be subject to the applicable provisions of Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 556a, 454a), as now or hereafter amended: *Provided*, That in any case of an incompetent veteran having no guardian, payment of compensation, pension, or retirement pay may be made in the discretion of the Administrator to the wife of such veteran for the use of the veteran and his dependents: *And provided further*, That payment of death benefits to a widow for herself and child or children, if any, may be made directly to such widow, notwithstanding she may be a minor. The act of August 8, 1882 (22 Stat. 373; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 44), is hereby repealed and any other law in conflict herewith is modified accordingly."

SEC. 3. Paragraph XXI of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"XXI. Any person entitled to pension or compensation under any law or Veterans Regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration may renounce his right thereto. The application renouncing the right shall be in writing over the person's signature and upon filing of such application, payment of such benefits and the right thereto shall be terminated and he shall be denied any and all rights thereto from date of receipt of such application by the Veterans' Administration. The renouncement provided for herein shall not preclude the person from filing a new application for pension or compensation at a future date but such application shall have the attributes of an original application and no payment will be made for any period prior to the date thereof."

SEC. 4. Any person shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies shall forfeit all accrued or future benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to gratuities for veterans and their dependents: *Provided, however*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his discretion, may apportion and pay any part of such benefits to the dependents of such person not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

SEC. 5. When any person entitled to compensation, pension, or other gratuity under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration is located in the territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or of any of its allies, any award of such benefits in favor of such person shall be terminated forthwith and such

person shall not be entitled to any such benefits except upon the filing of a new claim accompanied by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs showing that the claimant was not guilty of any of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of this act: *Provided*, That no compensation, pension, or other gratuity shall be paid for any period prior to the date of such new claim: *Provided further*, That while such person is located in a territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or any of its allies, any part of the benefits to which such person would otherwise be entitled may, in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be apportioned and paid to the dependents of such person who are in the United States or in a place not occupied or controlled by such enemy, except that the amount so apportioned and paid shall not exceed the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

Sec. 6. Paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and substituting therefor a colon and the following: "of a World War II veteran—who was married to the veteran prior to the expiration of 10 years subsequent to the termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

Sec. 7. Paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series is hereby amended to read as follows:

"VI. The term 'child' shall mean a person unmarried and under the age of 18 years, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 years the child becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, who is a legitimate child; a child legally adopted; a step-child if a member of the man's household; an illegitimate child but as to the father only if acknowledged in writing, signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to the child's support or has been, prior to his death judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or if he is otherwise shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be the putative father of such child: *Provided*, That the payment of pension shall be continued after the eighteenth birthday and until completion of education or training (but not after such child reaches the age of 21 years), to any child who is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction at a school, college, academy, seminary, technical institute, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Administrator, which shall have agreed to report to the Administrator the termination of attendance of such child, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such report promptly the approval shall be withdrawn."

Sec. 8. Paragraph VII of Veterans Regulation No. 10 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"VII. The terms 'parent,' 'father,' and 'mother' include a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year: *Provided*, That no more than one father and one mother, as defined, shall be recognized in any case, and preference shall be given to such father or mother who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of entry into active service by the person who served."

Sec. 9. (a) Paragraph I (a), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended, (a) by inserting after "April 1, 1920;" the phrase "or during an enlistment

or employment entered into on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress"; and (b) by inserting after the phrase "or active service in the World War" the phrase "or in World War No. 2."

(b) Paragraph I (b), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) That for the purposes of paragraph I (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment."

Sec. 10. Service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress shall be considered active military or naval service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Sec. 11. Section 1 (c) of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended by section 1 of the act of July 19, 1939 (Public Law No. 198, 76th Cong., U. S. C., title 38, sec. 503 (c)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Payment of compensation under the provisions of this act shall not be made to any widow without child, or a child, whose annual income exceeds \$1,000, or to a widow with a child or children whose annual income exceeds \$2,500. In determining annual income any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered: *Provided*, That where payments to a widow are disallowed or discontinued hereunder, payment to a child or children of the deceased veteran may be made as though there is no widow."

Sec. 12. Paragraph V, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), is amended to read as follows:

"V. (1) Pension, compensation, or retirement pay authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, to which a person was entitled prior to the date of his death, and not paid during his lifetime, and due and unpaid for a period not to exceed 1 year prior to death under existing ratings or decisions, or those based on evidence in the file at date of death, shall, upon the death of such person, be paid as herein-after set forth:

"(a) Upon the death of a person receiving an apportioned share of the veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay, all or any part of such unpaid amount, to the veteran or to any other dependent or dependents as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

"(b) Upon the death of a veteran, to the surviving spouse; or if there be no surviving spouse, to the child or children, dependent mother or father in the order named;

"(c) Upon the death of a widow or remarried widow, to the veteran's child or children;

"(d) Upon the death of a child, to the surviving child or children of the veteran, entitled to death compensation or pension;

"(e) In all other cases, only so much of the unpaid pension, compensation, or retirement pay may be paid as may be necessary to reimburse a person who bore the expense of last sickness and burial: *Provided, however*, That no part of any of the accrued pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall be

used to reimburse any political subdivision of the United States for expense incurred in the last sickness or burial of such person;

"(f) Payment of the benefits authorized by this paragraph will not be made unless claim therefor be received in the Veterans' Administration within 1 year from the date of death of the beneficiary or 1 year after date of this enactment, whichever is later, and such claim is perfected by the submission of the necessary evidence within 1 year from the date of the request therefor by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided, however*, That a claim for compensation or pension by an apportionee, widow, child, or dependent parent shall be deemed to include claim for any accrued benefits.

"(2) A check received by a payee in payment of pension compensation, or retirement pay shall, in the event of the death of the payee on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, become an asset of the estate of the deceased payee.

"(3) All acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this section are hereby repealed."

Sec. 13. Paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"VI. (A) Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, any pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not exceed \$20 per month: *Provided*, That the amount payable for any such disabled veteran, entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability under the provisions of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, shall not exceed \$8 per month. Where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, has a wife, child, or dependent parent, the pension, compensation, or retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

"(B) Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, and shall be deemed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be insane, the pension, compensation, or retirement pay for such veteran shall be in the amounts specified in (A) above: *Provided*, That in any case where the estate of such disabled insane veteran derived from any source equals or exceeds \$1,500, further payments of such benefits will not be made until the estate is reduced to \$500. Any such veteran without such dependent or dependents, when maintained at his own expense in an institution, shall be subject to the foregoing limitations but shall be paid such amount otherwise payable as equals the amount charged for his care and maintenance in such institution not exceeding the amount the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines to be the charge as fixed by any applicable statute or valid administrative regulation: *Provided further*, That all or any part of the pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of any such veteran may, in the discretion of the Administrator, and in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator, be paid to the chief officer of the institution wherein the disabled veteran is maintained, to be properly accounted for by said chief officer and to be used for the benefit of the disabled veteran; or may be paid to the guardian of the disabled veteran in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; or, in the event the dis-

abled veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent, may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be paid to his wife or apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent; or otherwise be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended.

"(C) Any veteran subject to the provisions of subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be deemed to be single and without dependents in the absence of satisfactory evidence to the contrary: *Provided*, That in no event shall increased compensation, pension, or retirement pay of such veteran be granted for any period more than 6 months prior to receipt of satisfactory evidence showing such veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent.

"(D) The pension of any disabled veteran who is an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home on the date of this enactment, shall not be reduced or discontinued by reason of the provisions of (A), (B), or (C) above.

"(E) The provisos of section 3 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 383; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 364b), and of sections 2 and 4 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492, 493; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 365a, 365c); that part of the proviso of section 5 of the act of July 3, 1926, extending to and ending with a semicolon (44 Stat. 807; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 321a); the second proviso of section 5 of the act of June 9, 1930 (44 Stat. 530; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 321c); the third proviso of section 1 of the act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 786; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381-1); the first proviso of section 4 of the act of May 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 440; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 370c); and all other provisions of law or regulation in conflict with the foregoing provisions are hereby repealed or modified accordingly."

SEC. 14. (a) The surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased person, entitled to wartime service-connected death compensation or pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of section 5 of Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved July 19, 1939, as amended (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 472b, 472b-1, 357b), shall be entitled to receive compensation or pension at the monthly rates specified below:

Widow but no child, \$50; widow with one child, \$65, with \$13 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, \$25; no widow but two children, \$38 (equally divided) with \$10 for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided). As to the widow, child, or children, the total amount payable under this paragraph shall not exceed \$100.

(b) The surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased person, entitled to peacetime service-connected death pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of section 1 of Public Law No. 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 731), shall be entitled to receive pension at the monthly rates specified below:

Widow but no child, \$38; widow with one child, \$49, with \$10 for each additional child (subject to apportionment regulations); no widow but one child, \$19; no widow but two children, \$28 (equally divided) with \$8 for each additional child (total amount to be equally divided). As to the widow, child, or children, the total pension payable under this paragraph shall not exceed \$75.

(c) As to such persons who now are on the compensation or pension rolls or are applicants for compensation or pension and are found entitled, at said rates, the compensation or pension or increase thereof at the rates authorized in (a) or (b) of this section shall commence on the 1st day of the month following the month in which this act is enacted, and as to those filing claims hereafter

and found entitled to said rates, compensation, or pension payable under this section shall begin as authorized in existing law and regulations: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation or pension authorized by this section shall not be awarded for any period prior to the 1st day of the month following the month of enactment of this act.

SEC. 15. Paragraph XIII of Veterans Regulation No. 10 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"XIII. Not more than one award of pension, compensation, or emergency officers' or regular retirement pay, shall be made concurrently to any person based on his own service. The receipt of pension or compensation by a widow, child, or parent on account of the death of any person, or receipt by any person of pension or compensation on account of his own service, shall not bar the payment of pension or compensation on account of the death or disability of any other person. This paragraph is hereby made applicable to all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Section 4715 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 25) and any other laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed or modified accordingly.

"Pension, compensation, or retirement pay on account of his own service shall not be paid while the person is in receipt of active service pay.

"The third proviso of paragraph 2 of section 1 of the act of March 3, 1891 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 26); the last proviso of paragraph 2 of section 3 of the act of January 28, 1915 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 27), and any other provision of law or veterans regulation contrary hereto is hereby repealed or modified accordingly."

SEC. 16. This act shall be effective from the date it is approved and necessary adjustments in awards shall be made effective unless otherwise provided herein, the 1st of the calendar month following adjudicative action, or the 1st of the calendar month following date of receipt of claim, whichever is the earlier. In all other cases benefits authorized by virtue of this act shall be effective from date of receipt of claim therefor under this act and subject to the provisions that death compensation or death pension shall be effective as of the day following the date of death of the veteran if claim is filed within 1 year after the death of the veteran: *Provided*, That in no event shall payments authorized by this act be made for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 17. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pension payable for disability shall be payable from date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 107]

Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	O'Leary
Andrews	Elmer	Pace
Baldwin, Md.	Fay	Pfeiffer
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fish	Phillips
Barden	Fitzpatrick	Ploeser
Barry	Ford	Ramey
Bates, Mass.	Furlong	Randolph
Bell	Gamble	Rivers
Bonner	Gavagan	Risley
Boren	Gifford	Rodgers, Pa.
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	Satterfield
Bradley, Pa.	Green	Schuetz
Brehm	Halleck	Scott
Brooks	Hare	Shafer
Buckley	Hébert	Sheridan
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Short
Camp	Jarman	Simpson, Pa.
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Capozzoli	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Carlson, Kans.	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Celler	King	Snyder
Cochran	Lane	Stearns, N. H.
Cooley	LeFevre	Taylor
Costello	Luce	Tolan
Courtney	McLean	Towe
Crawford	May	Treadway
Culkin	Merritt	Van Zandt
Dawson	Monroney	Vincent, Ky
Delaney	Morrison, N. C.	Vinson, Ga.
Dies	Mundt	Voorhis, Calif.
Dillweg	Murray, Tenn.	Wheat
Ditter	Myers	Wheelchel, Ga.
Domengeaux	Nichols	White
Douglas	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Eberharter	O'Konski	Wolcott

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call, 326 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion by Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS AFFECTING COMPENSATION, PENSIONS, AND RETIREMENT PAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the bill is improperly brought in by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and that it belongs to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order comes too late. The committee has reported the bill, and it is now under consideration under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. LESINSKI. I know; but Mr. Speaker, the bill was brought in to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in typewritten form on one day, passed the same day, and filed the same day. There was no time for the chairman of any other committee to make an objection at the time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Michigan does not know it, but a motion to suspend the rules suspends all rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The purpose of a motion to suspend the rules, of course, is to suspend all rules of the House.

The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was prepared at the instance of the Veterans' Administration. It is designed to correct certain inequalities arising under existing law with a view to simplifying adjudicative practices and administrative procedure by establishing uniform provisions wherever that is possible.

A great deal of confusion and embarrassment has grown up in the Veterans' Administration with reference to administering the various laws that have been passed touching beneficiaries of veterans' legislation. This measure is designed to straighten out those inequalities.

Under present law, when a service-connected disabled veteran goes to a hospital, if he has no dependents his compensation is cut to \$15 a month. This bill raises it to \$20 a month.

Under the present law when a man without dependents who is drawing compensation for a non-service-connected disability goes to a hospital, his compensation is reduced to \$6 a month. We raise it to \$8 a month.

A great many men have asked why veterans' compensations have been reduced when they go to hospitals, that is, veterans who have no dependents. Back in the twenties we found that a great many men would go to hospitals and stay there, thus depriving other veterans of the use of the facilities they needed. For that reason this provision was written into the law. However, owing to the increase in the cost of living these provisions have been inserted increasing the pay as stated.

The only objection raised by the Bureau of the Budget was to the language with reference to non-service-connected disability cases. I am sure that if the man in the Bureau of the Budget who handled the measure had understood it thoroughly he would not have raised that objection.

The bill also provides for adjusting the compensation of widows of service-connected World War veterans in order that there might not be so many different brackets. You will find that they are all given the same pay as the widow of a service-connected World War veteran who has reached the age of 50 years.

This would increase the cost of this bill \$4,536,000 a year. General Hines, in his letter to the Senate committee, has this to say:

In view of the inequalities which will be corrected, the changes which would result from simplification of adjudicating practices and administrative procedure, and the fact that the saving effected will materially reduce the additional cost, it is desirable that this legislation be secured at the earliest possible date.

There are some other amendments on page 7. There is one amendment to which I wish you would all pay attention. The practice has grown up, it seems, during the present war of keeping certain men in the Army until they finally break down mentally, nervously, or physically and then discharging them on the theory that their disabilities antedated induction into the service. In order to take care of those cases we have inserted this amendment:

That for the purposes of paragraph I (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

When the Army or Navy takes a young man into the service, it is the duty of the Army or the Navy to examine him carefully and not to keep him there for a year or two, until he breaks down, and then attribute his disability to a pre-war disorder.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. Is that retroactive for those that have been discharged, who have served for 90 days?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I think so.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I believe the whole bill is meritorious, but I wonder if the Chairman would not agree with me that some proviso should be written into the bill, probably in the other body, to this effect. You are taking out the proviso for medical opinion. Would it not be well to put in section (b) a proviso that would protect the Government against deliberate fraud at the time the man goes into the service.

Mr. RANKIN. You do not have to protect against fraud, because fraud vitiates everything it touches.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not have in mind what we might call legal fraud, but a person could cover up from the Army doctor the fact that he is a diabetic, and he might be there for 90 days.

Mr. RANKIN. I think any cases of that kind would be so rare that we probably would never be called upon for special legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Perhaps I do not make myself clear, but that is quite prevalent, I say to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], as this is an amendment to the former World War legislation, in my opinion it is retroactive. On the last page section 17 reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pension payable for disability shall be payable from date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge.

I think that probably would help to answer the gentleman's question. This applies to veterans who have service-connected disability. I think that provision is entirely in order.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word with reference to the jurisdiction of this committee. This bill was referred to our committee by the Speaker. It was asked for originally by the Veterans' Administration. We called the Administrator before the committee and went very carefully over the matter and amended it in certain respects. There is no question about our committee having jurisdiction of the bill. We should have jurisdiction of all legislation concerning disabled veterans of World War

No. 2, because they are all interlocked, through insurance, to hospitalization provisions, and through other and sundry legislation and regulations, which all comes under the jurisdiction of our committee. The committee has jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, and of legislation affecting it, and we should not only have this legislation, which is very properly referred to us by the Speaker, but we should have jurisdiction of all legislation touching disabled veterans of this war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that all disabled cases are processed through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. And where their compensation is affected as a result of their being hospitalized, through our legislation, it is all so interwoven and interlocked that it would be necessary for us to handle them both.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. There has been quite a difference as to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Committee and other committees. I wonder if the gentleman would agree that instead of having three different committees, we give jurisdiction to one committee, and eliminate all this friction that has existed for the last two sessions?

Mr. RANKIN. I have never asked for that change. The Committee on Invalid Pensions has jurisdiction of Civil War pensions. There are a few Civil War widows still living, and I would prefer to let that legislation remain as it is until that problem is out of the way. For that reason I have never asked for a consolidation of these committees.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The supply of the report is exhausted. Was the gentleman's committee unanimous in reporting this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman please explain section 10 on page 7?

Mr. RANKIN. That section reads as follows:

SEC. 10. Service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress shall be considered active military or naval service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

That was recommended by the Veterans' Administration, and gives these boys the benefit of that service whenever it comes to considering the question of longevity. For instance, if a man has been there for a certain length of time, that time is to be taken into consideration.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that my committee is a Civil War committee. It has jurisdiction of all wars, excepting the World War.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course, the gentleman is entirely wrong. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes. I should like to bring attention especially to the very important provision of the bill with respect to the time a man is taken into the service. I quote the amendment which provides that at the time he is taken in he will be considered sound physically and mentally.

(b) That for the purposes of paragraph 1 (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

It is an extremely important division. Many Members are having difficulty with the claims of disabled veterans who are their constituents. I will yield later to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] who will give some cases in point. I bring to the attention of the House again the fact that General Hines asked for this legislation. The legislation has the unanimous support of the committee. There was no opposition to it at all in the committee. Our committee has worked in perfect harmony. It had the unanimous recommendation of the veterans' organizations, men who have fought so consistently down through the years for benefits for veterans. I know the disabled of this World War are very grateful to the Congress for providing machinery by which their claims may be speedily adjusted. I remember very well the difficulties they had during the First World War, especially before the World War Veterans' Committee was set up.

I am delighted that all widows have \$50, which is what only women over 50 years receive under the present law. Also, for the increase for the men without dependents in hospitals, from \$15 to \$20 seems right, and from \$6 to \$8 for non-service-connected cases.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does this cover the ladies who have gone into the service as well as the men? It covers the nurses and the women doctors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It does not cover the WAAC's so far as national life insurance is concerned. I hope it will soon cover them. It does include them all in the hospital benefits. The WAAC's, WAVES, the SPARS, and marines receive their compensation under the civil employees' rules and regulations. I hope that will be adjusted later because it seems only fair when they take the place of men in the service that they be given the same benefits. They have no combat duties, as the gentleman knows, but they release men for combat duties. Sixty thousand WAAC's already have released four divisions of men for active duty and four divisions

were the number of our men used to fight in Africa.

The gentleman may remember the House recently passed legislation for the WAAC's, the WAVES, and the marines. When they pass the Senate and the President signs the bills these groups would then come under the provisions of this bill. The legislation for the SPARS will pass soon, I am sure. All groups have done magnificent work.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] who has one or two cases that he would like to present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have sent for my files covering three cases, two of which I would like to inquire about. Before I inquire, I want to say I am heartily in favor of this legislation as it is a long step in the right direction. I just hope that further amendments will be made to the law in due course to take care of cases such as those I will discuss.

The first case I wish to inquire about is the case of a man who was inducted into the armed service and who protested and whose wife protested at the time of his induction, that he was a sick man, suffering from tuberculosis and that while his case was improving he was still running temperatures. Nevertheless the examining physician said he was O. K. and he was inducted. Within 2 weeks after he was inducted he was in a hospital, suffering horribly, and in due course when his release was requested he was asked to sign a waiver saying that the Government was in no way responsible. He did not want to sign the waiver but found that he would not be released until he did. He finally signed it and was discharged with a medical certificate stating that prior to his induction he had had valvular heart disease and aortic insufficiency. On induction it was remarked that he had an excellent, strong heart. I want to know whether this case, which resulted in less than 60 days in service instead of the 90 days provided in the act, is covered in any way?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from California that this bill would not change the status of a man in that condition unless he had been in the service for 90 days.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have another case of a fine strong young man who was called from the Reserves into active duty. A few days after he was called to active duty he was given all three shots, I believe for yellow fever, at one time. He was sent out the next day on a maneuver in temperatures of from 95° to 100°, and he came down shortly after the maneuver with a high temperature and went out of his mind. He was treated as a demented person instead of as a sick man and nearly died. He was later declared to have been suffering from dementia praecox prior to active duty by an Army retirement board and was retired without allowances as insurable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. He was discharged as being in a hopeless, helpless condition, more than 90 days after his call to active duty in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. RANKIN. If the veteran's disability was caused by the shots given him, he would be entitled to compensation. If he was suffering from dementia praecox, which is a progressive mental disease that gradually grows worse until the patient dies, and was suffering from it at the time he was in the service, this bill would not cover it.

Mr. HINSHAW. He was suffering from nothing whatever except medical malpractice and improper treatment in the Army hospital, and they discharged him on the ground that he had dementia praecox and was incurable, yet with 3 months of treatment by competent physicians, after discharge, he was quite normal again. He had no dementia praecox and never did have.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, if he is totally well, he has not been injured.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, at some appropriate time in the future I intend to ask for time to discuss several bad cases, including this one, in some detail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the support of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the D. A. V., and the Purple Heart organizations. It also has the endorsement and support of the head of the Veterans' Administration, General Hines. It should have the support of everyone who is interested in equality and justice for the veterans of this and all past wars.

I desire to take up the bill and deal with it section by section. Section 1 I shall pass over because it is merely descriptive. Section 2 contains two provisions. The first one provides that in case of an incompetent veteran having no guardian, any compensation, pension or retirement pay may be made to his wife at the discretion of the Veterans' Administration and without the appointment of a guardian.

The lawyer Members of the House will appreciate the importance of that provision to the veteran. I have had experiences of my own in handling estates or money for members of the armed forces of the last war, who were incompetent or deceased, and the court costs and bond and so forth necessary to handle that little money practically ate it up, taking it away from the widow or the children of the veterans. That provision in itself is worth the entire bill.

The next portion, section 2, provides that when death benefits are payable to the widow of a veteran or for the child, it will be paid to the widow for herself and for the child, even though the widow

herself be a minor. Many cases have arisen where the wife of a veteran was not of age, and the Veterans' Administration could not pay the money that was justly due her without a guardian being appointed or administration taken out, thus eating up a portion of the money that rightfully belonged to the family of the veteran.

Section 3 provides that any person entitled to a pension, compensation, or benefits, may rescind or reject his rights to this compensation for any reason he may choose, and later apply for it again without in any way having the rights in the second application altered or changed except that on the second application it must start from the date of application and will not be retroactive.

Section 4 provides that any person found to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or aiding the enemies of the United States shall forfeit all benefits, provided, however, that the Veterans' Administrator may, in his discretion, pay benefits that otherwise would be due the soldier or veteran to members of his family upon his death.

Section 5 deals with persons entitled to compensation, pension, or gratuities who are located in an enemy country.

Section 6 refers to widows of World War No. 2 not married prior to the expiration of 10 years subsequent to the end of hostilities. I think it is fair to state that section means it will prevent marriages for the purpose of getting benefits or compensation of a soldier knowing that he is about to die.

Section 7 defines a child.

Section 8 defines parents, father, and mother.

Section 9 extends the benefits of the present veterans' facilities just the same to veterans of World War No. 2 as are extended to the veterans of World War No. 1.

Section 9 also contains the 90-day presumptive clause, referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Massachusetts, that any person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days is presumed to have been in sound condition when examined and accepted in the service, except as to defects, infirmities, and disorders noted at the time of acceptance.

It was the feeling on the part of the members of the committee when this section was under discussion that it was up to the Army doctors to find out what was the matter with the soldier when he was accepted.

The remaining sections are equally important to the veteran and his dependents in order that they may secure equity and justice.

The additional cost of the bill will largely be offset by the savings that will ensue from the simplification of procedure.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the ranking member, Mrs. ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and the members of the committee are to be congratulated in bringing to the floor such a constructive and forward-looking piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have heard the discussion among the Members of the House as to the problems of jurisdiction on veterans' legislation. I would like to say this: I believe if we were going to have an operation on our eyes we would not go down and select a chiropractor to perform that operation. Likewise, all legislation in behalf of our veterans who served in World War No. 2 should be referred to the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, because that is the only committee that has the experience and benefit of the knowledge of the veterans' problems, through many years of handling that legislation in the House. And I wish to say that our World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, under the direction of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], has made its place not only in the history of this country but also in the hearts of the veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart are wholeheartedly behind this legislation, and the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the chairman of this committee, has the confidence of these organizations. I do not believe there is a man in this Congress who has the welfare of our veterans at heart any more than the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. For many years he has labored in behalf of the veterans and has faithfully carried out the policies formulated during the time when the late Honorable Royal C. Johnson was chairman of the committee; and as long as he is a Member of this House I know he will continue to do so.

As a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and also of the American Legion, I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that we are deeply grateful to him for the wonderful service that he has performed for the veterans of this country, and I know that the mothers, fathers and veterans of World War No. 2 will be forever deeply appreciative of his untiring efforts in their behalf.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] 2 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in what space of time I have had to glance at the bill I think the bill is in the right direction. But what I want to call your attention to is this: The bill is called up under suspension, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] secured the privilege, under the rule, when she demanded a second, and under that procedure the minority, if there is one, is precluded from demanding the right to be heard.

I am calling attention to that now because I do not believe such practice in the future should be permitted, and that if a second is demanded it should be demanded by those who are opposed, or those in the minority whether on the minority side or on the majority side, so

that those who are opposed to any legislation would not be deprived of the right to be heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not correct the opposition did not demand a second? Therefore it is only because of the interest of the lady from Massachusetts in the legislation that she demanded the second.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, the lady from Massachusetts does not need any defense as we all know of her activities; she has always been active and is entitled to a great deal of credit for the splendid work she has done. We have had the question before the Rules Committee for the last 3 years and I have been trying to eliminate the friction that exists between these committees.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not, after all, under the jurisdiction of the Speaker to decide to whom the second shall go? The gentleman did not ask for a second; he made no demand. No one else asked for a second. I know the gentleman wishes to be fair. This procedure has been followed numerous times this past year.

Mr. SABATH. So far as my memory of the precedents goes it is to the effect that when a second is demanded it is demanded by the opposition to the pending bill. The rule for debate under suspensions provides 20 minutes on each side—20 minutes for and 20 minutes against, the 20 minutes in opposition going to the Member who demands a second. That means that he desires to be heard in opposition to the bill. The gentleman herself asked me before she agreed to yield to me whether I was for the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did.

Mr. SABATH. With the kindest of feeling toward the gentleman from Massachusetts who yielded 2 minutes to me, I wish to say that I have taken the floor in an endeavor to protect and make effective the rights and privileges of the minority accorded them under the regular rules of the House whether it be on the Republican side or the Democratic side. I believe it is setting a bad precedent to recognize a Member favoring legislation to second a motion for the suspension of the rules because it deprives the minority to be heard in opposition to the motion to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Massachusetts, 7.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, over a period of many years the Congress of the United States has repeatedly expressed its interest in the welfare of veterans and their dependents. Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I have the honor to be a member, has proposed and secured the enactment of laws to put veterans of World War No. 2 on the same basis with respect to benefits as the veterans of the First World War.

We have before us today a bill from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. This bill is the result of hard work by our committee. It proposes certain very badly needed changes in laws relating to veterans' affairs. It is an important preliminary step which must, in my opinion, be taken by Congress if we hope to make effective our manifest desire to do all we can for those sturdy citizens who today are giving their all for the Stars and Stripes.

I do not believe that there is any opposition to this bill on its merits. It is exceedingly regrettable that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has attempted to raise a false issue in our discussion of this bill. It would be unfortunate if through some jurisdictional squabble between committees of this House we should sidetrack this legislation. Certainly the veterans of the past war and those to be veterans of this war would not understand or appreciate such action.

It was suggested early in the debate that this legislation may have been hastily drawn. The reverse is true. The bill is carefully drawn. It is fully explained in a carefully drawn report available to each Member of the House. Extensive hearings were held on this legislation. Everybody interested was given opportunity to appear. I may say that the Veterans' Administration, as represented by the Administrator, Gen. Frank T. Hines, appeared and expressed approval of this bill. General Hines suggested some helpful things which were included in the bill. Every national veterans' organization in the United States appeared and expressed, through its representatives, approval of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a great and terrible war. It is the worst the world has ever seen. The question of veterans' legislation will become increasingly important because the war is presenting new problems which must be met by the people's representatives in Congress. Let us face the problems posed by this bill today. Let us approve without a dissenting vote this legislation which means so much to our fighting men and their dependents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY].

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the importance of this legislation now with reference to the millions of men and women who are presently in

the armed forces and many of whom will qualify for the type of relief provided hereunder. It is a tribute to the Veterans' Administration that its representatives have come before this committee and have outlined those provisions which they feel will facilitate the operation of its work in view of the tremendously increased load which is expected. I should like to emphasize again that the action in reporting out this bill was unanimous on the part of the committee after hearings were duly had and with the endorsement of the various veterans' organizations which have been related here this afternoon.

The importance from the administrative point of view lies in the experiences of those in the armed service today. The welfare of these millions of Americans must be planned and assured now. This bill deserves the unanimous support of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio yields back one-half minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON].

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to suspend the rules of the House and pass H. R. 2703. This measure amends quite a number of pension and compensation acts and will bring substantial benefits to many disabled veterans who do not now receive compensation, and it will increase the compensation of many veterans, and it will increase the pensions of thousands of widows and children of veterans. It confers on veterans of World War No. 2 many of the benefits now enjoyed by veterans of World War No. 1.

While this measure does not go as far as myself and many other members would desire it to go, yet we are advised that this is the best bill that can receive consideration at this time. Being brought up under suspension of the rules, there is no way to amend the bill as submitted by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. I am satisfied that they have brought out the best bill possible under all of the circumstances, and I am very glad to have an opportunity to be present and to give it my unqualified approval and support, and trust that it will be adopted without a single vote in opposition.

Among the helpful features in this bill are the following:

Every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, and disorders noted at the time of acceptance and enrollment.

The applications of many disabled veterans have been denied and compensation withheld from these disabled veterans on the ground that their disabilities were contracted prior to their entry into the service, when there was

no notation that any disabilities existed at the time they were examined, accepted, and enrolled. We think it very unfair to the disabled veterans when they apply for compensation for the Government to go behind its own records and deny compensation to these veterans. The presumption is that the doctors who examined the veterans on their acceptance for service did an honest and fair job, and when these boys are once accepted the Government should not be permitted years thereafter to claim that they were not in good condition at the time of acceptance, when the records made by the War and Navy Departments showed that they were in good condition at the time of their acceptance. This is a most desirable amendment, and I am very glad to give it my active support.

This measure amends another act in that it provides that the disabled veteran shall receive compensation from the date of his discharge if it be shown that he had service-connected disability at the time of discharge, provided he filed his claim within 1 year from the date of his discharge. Under the present law he can only secure compensation from the date he makes his application.

This measure increases from \$15 to \$20 per month the amount of compensation that can be paid to veterans without dependents confined to some Government hospital. This measure would greatly benefit disabled veterans of World War No. 2, and it makes in order the payment of increases of benefits to thousands of disabled veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, and the Spanish-American War veterans.

At the present time a different rate of pension, according to age, is paid to widows of veterans whose death was due to service. Those under 50 years of age now receive \$38 per month, and those over 50 years of age receive \$45 per month. Under this measure, these widows without respect to age will receive \$50 per month. It is pointed out that the younger widows, in many instances, have children and other family obligations that make it necessary to receive as much pension as those who are over 50 and without young children and other family obligations.

Under the present law widows of veterans receive so much for themselves and so much for each child, according to its age. This measure grants to the widow \$13 per month for the first child and for additional children, in all not to exceed \$65.

Under the present law, where there is a child or children but no widow, the rate is \$20 per month for the first child, \$33 per month for two children, \$46 per month for three children, and \$8 for each additional child, with the total amount to children without widow not to exceed \$83. Under this measure, children with no widow, the first child will receive \$25 per month, two children \$38 per month, each additional child \$10 per month, with the total amount for children without widow not to exceed \$100 per month. It can be seen at once that this measure will be very helpful to widows and children of deceased veterans.

This bill also will benefit many veterans and their dependents in liberalizing the procedure.

VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS ENTITLED TO INCREASE

There are quite a number of bills now pending in the House and Senate that propose granting a straight increase of from 15 to 25 percent on the pensions of the veterans and their dependents who are now on the pension rolls. It is generally conceded that the cost of living has increased 25 percent since the acts were passed granting these pensions, and by reason of this great increase in the cost of living hundreds of thousands of our disabled veterans and their dependents have been hard hit indeed. It is a source of regret to me and many others in the Senate and House that we have not had an opportunity to vote on some one of these bills. We have been assured, however, by the chairman and some of the members of World War Veterans' Legislative Committee of the House that some time this summer or fall one of these bills will be reported to the House, and that we will be given an opportunity to vote on it. There has been a great increase in the incomes of the American people generally. We must not overlook the needs of our disabled veterans and their dependents. Under lend-lease and other activities we are literally giving away to people of other nations, in money, food, clothing, and other supplies, tens of billions. These supplies are going to the people of every nation in the world, with the exception of Germany, Italy, Japan, Rumania, and Hungary, and the people of many of the countries that we are helping have not joined with our country in actual warfare against the Axis Powers.

I wish to repeat what I have said many times on the floor of the House, Senate, and elsewhere, one of the best investments that this country can make in promoting national defense is to do justice to those who have and are defending our country on land, sea, and in the air, and their dependents. To know that this great country will never neglect them or their dependents in case they become disabled or lose their lives must add greatly to the patriotic zeal of our boys. Our boys everywhere are doing a wonderful job, as did the veterans of all of our other wars, and we want them to know that they and their dependents come first in the hearts and minds of the patriotic people of this country. They have and are defending and protecting us and we must do everything possible to defend and protect them and their dependents, and in the generosity of this Nation to the people of other countries let us not neglect those who have a first and everlasting obligation upon us—our own defenders and their widows, orphans, and dependent parents. I feel I express the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the House and the Senate and the American people, that our committees handling legislation for veterans and their dependents will respond to this sentiment and report the measures to the House and Senate in the near future, and give the House and the Senate an opportunity

to give substantial help to our veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this bill which is now before us for consideration (H. R. 2703). As the title of the bill states, its purpose is to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay, payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes. With reference to the bill, General Hines said:

In view of the inequalities which will be corrected, the changes which would result from simplification of adjudicating practices and administrative procedure, and the fact that the saving effected will materially reduce the additional cost, it is desirable that this legislation be secured at the earliest possible date.

This bill was prepared at the instance of the Veterans' Administration. I am advised that this bill is being supported not only by the Veterans' Administration but by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart. It will bring about changes in veteran administration which have been needed for some time. It will do away with confusion and will simplify and adjust veterans' compensation so that the inequalities which now exist will be done away with. While it is true some increases are provided in compensation, which will result in an increased cost estimated to be \$4,536,000 a year, it will place veterans on an equality and the additional cost will be well spent.

The members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation are deserving of commendation for their work in perfecting this legislation and bringing it to the House for consideration and adoption. Members of the committee have explained in detail the various provisions of the bill. No good service would be served by adding to these clear explanations already given. I do, however, desire to call attention to the amendment to the bill, reading as follows:

That for the purposes of paragraph 1 (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

There has developed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the administration of veterans' compensation which this amendment will eliminate. On June 1 I called to the attention of the House a protest which was contained in an editorial appearing in Disabled American Veterans Semi-Monthly of its issue of April 29, entitled "We Protest." It was contended that an alleged procedure or practice in the War Department in the issuance of certificates of disability or discharge was being engaged in where pressure was being brought upon servicemen to sign affidavits or make admis-

sions without full knowledge or information, to the effect that they were suffering from disabilities alleged to exist prior to their induction into the Army, as an inducement to secure certain benefits. Such allegations and admissions in many cases were without any foundation in truth. I sent to the Secretary of War the following letter:

MAY 21, 1943.

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,

Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Herman E. Lafky, commander, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has called to my attention a practice which he states exists in the War Department of discharging disabled servicemen with foreign combat service, on the basis of alleged preexisting disabilities, and requiring them to prejudge and prejudice their case by signing releases of all disabilities before receiving consideration for present disabilities.

I will appreciate it if you will advise me if such a policy does exist, and the reason therefor.

Yours truly,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

To this letter I received the following reply from John W. Martyn, Administrative Assistant:

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D. C., May 26, 1943.

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL,

House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of May 21, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, concerning disability discharges from the Army, which question was brought to your attention by Mr. Herman E. Lafky, commander, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Army regulations provide that a certificate of disability for discharge will state whether such disability was incurred in line of duty or not in line of duty, together with the facts upon which a decision is based; whether the enlisted man declined treatment for the relief of the disability when the same was directed; whether disability was due to his own misconduct or whether a preexisting disability, injury, or disease was or was not aggravated in line of duty by active military service, together with the nature of duty causing aggravation.

All individuals subject to disability discharge are examined by a board of officers who give consideration to the interests of the Government and of the enlisted man equally and impartially. Questions of doubt which cannot be decided factually are resolved in favor of the enlisted man. Whether the disability becomes apparent inside or outside the continental United States has no bearing on the decision as to the pre-existence of the disability.

Pensions are paid by the United States where it is determined that disability resulted from personal injury or disease contracted in line of duty or for aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease contracted or suffered in line of duty when such disability was incurred in or aggravated by active military service, unless the result of the individual's own misconduct.

On March 17, 1943, Public Law 10 (78th Cong.) was enacted, amending Veterans Regulations No. 10, granting hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to individuals honorably discharged for non-service-connected disability.

I trust the above information is sufficient to clarify this subject for your constituent.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, as shown by this correspondence, there is considerable question as to whether or not there are not sound reasons for the protest to which I have referred. When our Government accepts these servicemen into military service, after subjecting them to critical and exhaustive examinations to determine their fitness for service and freedom from any disqualifying ailments, such an examination should be binding upon the Government. Certainly after these men have been subjected to the rigors of exacting military service in foreign lands under conditions requiring a maximum of physical endurance and courage, they should not, upon the development of disabilities, be discharged from the Army under a pretense or claim that the disabilities from which they were suffering existed prior to their induction into the service. This amendment is intended to prevent this injustice being practiced upon our men in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us here in the Congress want to deal honestly and fairly with our men and women in military service. They have answered the call of their country in this tragic hour when its very existence as a nation is threatened, and they are burning their bridges behind them and placing their lives in jeopardy that this Nation and those of us who remain at home may be permitted to live in peace and safety when the war ends. By reason of their great contribution and sacrifice we must see that every fair and decent consideration is given to them and their dependents.

As I said in discussing this matter June 1 in the House, when the war ends, and God grant it may be soon, upward of 10,000,000 of the young manhood of our Nation will be returning to their homes. The first question that will present itself to them is, What will be their opportunity in their homeland to which they offered their lives to defend? Will they find remunerative employments open to them where they may again enter into the responsibilities of citizenship in a free world? These post-war problems require the consideration of every one of us, particularly Members of the Congress, who are charged with the responsibility of enacting the necessary legislation to make possible the reabsorption of these servicemen from a war economy into civilian pursuits in a world at peace. We must not only be certain that the men who return disabled and broken in body and spirit will be cared for with every consideration possible, but we also must make certain that the able-bodied will not be turned loose in a world which offers them no hope for continued self-respecting employment. It may well be that for a year or a year and a half after peace comes that our Government will find it necessary to continue the servicemen on the Government pay roll pending the time that avenues of employment open to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to support this legislation and trust that it may soon become the law of the land.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the House has under consideration H. R. 2703. This bill provides more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay, payable by the Veterans' Administration. It liberalizes the compensation, pension, and retirement pay for veterans, their widows, and their orphans. I shall support the bill. It has the unanimous approval of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Order of the Purple Heart, and the approval of General Hines of the Veterans' Administration.

In the brief time allotted to me it is not necessary to go into an extended explanation of the provisions of the bill. One of the best features of the bill is contained in section 9, which provides:

Every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment.

Many cases have been called to my attention since we became involved in the present World War of men having been inducted into the armed service and having been subjected to the hardship of military training for a period of more than 90 days who broke down mentally and physically and who have been discharged from the Army and sent home, carrying with them a discharge reciting that they were suffering from the disability or mental infirmities on account of which they were discharged at the time of their induction into the service. Some of these men, due to their violent mental condition, have been put in jail. The parents of others have been burdened with their support and care when they were financially unable to provide for the discharged soldier. This provision of the law takes care of that sort of a case.

Section 13 of the act provides that when a disabled veteran, having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, any pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not exceed \$20 per month—this is a raise from \$15 per month—provided that the amount payable for any such disabled veteran entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability shall not exceed \$8 per month.

By section 14 of the act the surviving widow, child, or children of any deceased veteran entitled to wartime service-connected death compensation or pension at the rates provided in paragraph 2 of Public Law 198, shall be entitled to receive compensation or pension at the following monthly rates: Widow but no child, \$50; widow with one child, \$65, with \$13 for each additional child.

Where there is no widow, but one child, \$25; no widow, but two children, \$38, equally divided, with \$10 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided. The total amount payable under this paragraph shall not exceed \$100.

In the case of a widow or children entitled to peacetime service-connected death pension, the widow with no child is pensioned at the rate of \$38; widow with one child, \$49, with \$10 for each additional child. The total pension payable under this paragraph shall not exceed \$75.

The act has many other meritorious provisions. It is a fair measure and I am glad to give it my support.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it is unanimous, Mr. Speaker; that is all.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will take the 3 minutes left to me.

First, I wish to reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. I think he ought to report out the resolution before the Committee on Rules to straighten out this jurisdiction of veterans' legislation. It should go to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. As to the gentleman's criticism as to who was entitled to recognition under this motion to suspend the rules, I desire to say that nobody who was opposed to the bill demanded a second.

We followed exactly the same procedure that has been followed by all other committees and by all other chairmen and ranking minority members on all other legislation that has come before the House during this session and in previous sessions.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that this committee has had a difficult problem in trying to take care of the World War veterans and the veterans of this war and at the same time keep wild and unnecessary and unjustifiable legislation off this floor. If we had so desired, we could have kept you in hot water day in and day out, but I have followed the procedure laid down by my predecessor as chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the Honorable Royal Johnson, of South Dakota. We have looked to the best interests of the veterans and the best interests of the country, and we expect to continue that program. There was no division in the committee on this bill, and I think every other bill we have reported this session was reported unanimously.

We do not harass the Congress by holding hearings day in and day out. We do not harass the Veterans' Administration by constant hearings; but we do investigate and try to find out what legislation is necessary and justified, then bring that legislation to the floor of the House.

If we cannot get the Rules Committee to give us a vote on that rule, I hope every Member of the House will sign petition No. 8 in obedience to the request of the veterans' organizations of the country, and let us forever settle this jurisdictional question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 194, noes 0.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Robert L. Norton which appeared in the Washington Post of June 16, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick and also a news article by Frank Waldrop appearing in the Washington Times Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FARM HOMESTEADS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, now that the Federal Government has canceled billions of dollars of legitimate taxes owing to it by prosperous taxpayers, and while we are giving away billions more in support of the economic life of our allies throughout the world, I think it most timely that we begin devoting more thought to some of the serious problems confronting us right here at home. And it might be well for us to think about spending a little of our money in effecting a permanent solution of some of these problems. The importance of this will become more evident in the months that lie immediately ahead of us.

The outstanding domestic problem that will confront this Nation at the close of the war will be that of rehabilitating our people on a self-sustaining basis.

Common sense dictates that the Government cannot go on forever supporting the people, but the Government can provide for each individual and each family an opportunity to support themselves, and it is the duty of the Government to do this.

There will be millions of men now in the armed forces who will be entitled to an opportunity to earn a decent living for themselves and their families. And millions more who are now in vital war industry must be afforded a like opportunity.

There are those who believe that the Government should meet this issue through direct employment by the Government, or by the Government actually furnishing food, clothing, and shelter for these individuals and their families. Such a program would of necessity change ours into a communistic government with the will of the individual absolutely subjected to the will of the state.

There are others, including myself, who do not believe that the Government should actually provide the food, shelter, and clothing for these individuals, but that the Government should provide for each individual or family an opportunity to earn for himself in the private walks of life these essential elements of life.

This task can be accomplished under our great American system of Government which is designed not to destroy but to foster and encourage private initiative, self-reliance, and individual effort. In accomplishing this task, however, under our traditional system and philosophy of government it is essential that we remember one simple and elementary, yet fundamental, truth and that is that our civilization is deep-rooted in the soil of this country and if it is to survive we must ever turn back to the soil for the essential nourishment and inspiration. We will have to start first with the land as the basis of our program.

I do not mean by this that every individual must turn to the soil for a living, but I do mean that the soil must inevitably furnish the basic means of livelihood for these millions of individuals who are to be rehabilitated.

As an initial move in such a program there first lies ahead of us the tremendous task of revising our national land policies so as to rehabilitate those who already live on the land and gain their livelihood by tilling the soil.

Next, we must throw open the fertile soil of this country to ownership by millions of families who may care to accept farming and the tilling of the soil as the means of owning a home and providing a livelihood.

To accomplish these things we must revise and modernize our traditional national land policy, weeding out those features that tend to blight and kill, and making such changes as will stimulate healthy growth.

In this discussion today I wish to point out some features of our national land policies which I believe to be destructive and to suggest some changes which I believe will prove beneficial.

Long before I ever seriously aspired to a seat in this great deliberative body it

became evident to me that unless something was done by some unit of the Government, either the State or the Federal Government, or both, to protect the farm land of this country for the ownership and use of the farm families of this country it would not be many years before the independent farm family living on its own land and secure in the ownership of its own farm home would vanish.

Living as I do in a rural community I have observed through the years that one by one the independent farm families have lost their farm homes and as a result they have likewise lost their means of independent livelihood.

The reason they have lost their farm homes has been the same in practically every instance. The farm has been made the collateral or security for financial obligations.

The farmer does not produce enough on the farm under normal conditions to meet these financial obligations and at the same time provide a living for himself and his family. Consequently he defaults in the payment of the farm debt and the mortgage is ultimately foreclosed.

May I point out here that in certain respects a tenant farmer occupies a more secure economic position than does the farmer who owns and operates a farm that has a mortgage over it, for under the laws of this country, on a farm that is operated by the owner, the holder of the farm mortgage has first claim to the proceeds of the farm, while on a farm that is operated by a tenant, the tenant has first claim to the proceeds of the farm. And when a farm is not producing enough to pay both the mortgage and support the farm family, the only way that the mortgage can be satisfied and the farm family can be assured of a living out of the operation of the farm is for the farm operator to give up his title or ownership to the land and become a tenant farmer.

In this way the terms of the farm mortgage are met by the transfer of the title to the mortgage holder, and the farm family is assured of a living by becoming a tenant farmer.

This is exactly what has been going on in this country for many years.

In the early life of this Republic the foreclosure of a farm mortgage did not necessarily mean tenantry for the farm family, because there was plenty of free land available for any family desiring free land. The farm family could remain independent by the simple process of moving to a plot of free land and again establishing a free farm homestead.

At the same time laborers engaged in pursuits other than farming were not forced to accept the terms of employment which they considered unjust and unfair. They were not dependent upon their employer for a living. The Government was always ready to furnish them with a free farm where they could live in freedom and independence.

Whenever the burden of debt or the injustices of employment became destructive of the rights of any citizen, he could always find refuge and relief in the free land of this country.

From the day when Columbus first sighted land on October 12, 1492, and the cry went up from the ship, "Land, land," free land has been one continuing and inspiring element underlying the progress and development of our great western civilization.

Without the millions of acres of free land and the vast free resources that were available in this country for occupancy and ownership by everyone who cared to take advantage of the opportunity, our theory of free government could never have prevailed.

Every one of the Thirteen Original Colonies was settled primarily by individuals and families who sought land which they could own themselves and upon which they could establish their homes and live in peace and security. This is likewise true of each of the 48 States of the Union.

In the beginning there was seemingly an unlimited amount of free land—land enough for all who might desire to own land and establish a home. Through the years, however, the frontier has been pushed back, the desirable free land has been homesteaded and placed in private possession, until today there is no free land left, and the opportunity for an individual or a family to gain possession of a free plot of land upon which to establish a free home has vanished. The free farm homestead is no longer a sustaining element in the life of our Republic.

We must again open up to our people this gateway of opportunity which is so essential to human liberty and to the preservation of human rights. We must again make available to individuals and to their families this channel of nourishment and inspiration if we are to continue to grow and prosper as a free people. This cornerstone of human freedom must be maintained if we are to preserve for our people the right to live in liberty and in the pursuit of happiness.

This can be done by modernizing our traditional land policies.

We must all remember that ours is a comparatively new civilization, and we are comparatively a virgin country. We are not beset with so many of the problems which confront the people in other lands. We are not an overpopulated Nation. We have 2,000,000,000 acres of land within the bounds of the United States of America, and 130,000,000 people, composing about 40,000,000 families. So you can see that if all the land in America was equally distributed it would be possible to give each family 50 acres of land.

Over 500,000,000 acres of our land is still under public domain representing mostly submarginal land that is not suitable for farm homes. Approximately 1,400,000,000 acres is in private ownership, and there are only 7,000,000 farm families.

So you can see that if the farm land was equally distributed among all the farm families, each family would own 200 acres of land.

It is, therefore, evident that we are not confronted with the problem of too many families or too little land.

Our problem is a comparatively simple one of making the farm land available for ownership by the farm family.

I am convinced, however, that if we are to accomplish this task we must proceed upon the theory that the farm homestead is both the home of the farm family and the instrumentality through which the farm family supports itself.

The lawyer can live in his home, but does not make his living out of his home. The manufacturer, merchant, the industrial laborer, the banker, lawyer, all live in their homes but do not make their livings out of their homes.

With the farmer, however, it is different. His farm is both his home and his means of livelihood.

If we are to proceed upon the theory that the farm is strictly a commercial operation then it is not necessary for us to take any legislative action, for that is just what we have been doing. It is easy to see that under the present system farms are being acquired by absentee landlords or by large farm operators who are farming for strictly commercial purposes and that farm land ownership in the United States has been gradually drifting into the clutches of practices which have prevailed in commerce and industry for centuries, and which, when permitted to go unchecked, have invariably destroyed the independent farm home, and reduced agriculture to a condition of serfdom. So long as we continue to consider the farm homestead as strictly a commercial institution, I do not see how we can possibly remedy this situation.

Proceeding upon this theory during the last quarter of a century Congress has devised numerous means of aiding the farmer. The Federal land bank plan was initiated. At first this seemed to be the ideal solution. However, it soon developed that the Federal land bank was only a means of helping plunge the farmer deeper into debt and the facts show that during normal times more Federal land bank mortgages are foreclosed than are ever paid by the owners. Then, too, the Federal land bank had no provision assuring homesteads for small independent farm families.

Then came various other legislative measures all of which have failed to accomplish this desired result, primarily because of the false premises upon which they are based.

During recent years there has been a growing tendency to give the farmer a better price for his commodities and I heartily subscribe to this as being only fair and just to the farmer and placing his products on an equal footing with the products of other activities. However, let us remember that with the increase in farm prices there runs concurrently an increase in all the other prices throughout our entire economic structure with the result of increased cost of living and increased land values so that little is accomplished by this process toward aiding the farmer to regain for himself his own free homestead.

In this connection we might just as well face the candid fact that the average farm under ordinary conditions will just about yield for the owner and his family a reasonable livelihood. In other words, the average farm is the means of a living for the farmer and his family and can hardly be described as a commercial institution from which the owner may hope to gain any substantial financial profit.

There are those who in recent years, in their efforts to solve this problem of farm home ownership, have introduced theories which have heretofore been foreign to our way of thinking. They believe in solving the problem through a system of bureaucracy or a planned economy, which would regiment the farmers under a highly centralized communistic and paternalistic rule—a system which would make all the farmers the tenants of the Government. As I say, this theory is new to the American way of thinking and is now being vigorously promoted by those who are either not familiar with the American theory of Government and the plan of our free institutions, or else who do not believe in our American way and who are deliberately attempting to replace it with their own theories and their own philosophy of life. If the doctrine which they advocate prevails it is bound to stifle the private initiative and the individualism of the people of this country and thus lose to them the great heritage which has been gained for them by our forefathers who conceived and designed our American theory of Government. After we have won this war and should we gain domain over all the world, still if we have lost our rights as American citizens we have then lost the very soul of our American Republic. "For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul."

There is a third method of approach in solving this problem, and that is for us to apply the real genuine old fashioned American theory of government and the American philosophy of life.

Proceeding along this line there are several approaches that can be made, any one of which is comparatively simple and will prove effective.

I have introduced legislation designed to partially accomplish this result, and I wish to briefly explain the provisions of this very simple measure, H. R. 1300, which is entitled "A bill to establish a national land policy and to provide homesteads for actual farm families."

May I also call your attention to H. R. 1287, which deals with the same subject matter. It is more far-reaching than H. R. 1300, but, in my opinion, it offers a more practical and common sense solution of this problem.

Both of these measures are very easily understood, and either measure can be placed in operation without the necessity of new or additional Government agencies.

H. R. 1300 provides that the Federal Government, through the General Land Office, regain title to farm lands by the purchase of farm mortgages or liens

upon farm property. It provides that the lands so acquired be divided into homestead tracts; that there be assessed against each homestead tract its pro rata share of the purchase price; and that these homestead tracts then be made available for private entry and ownership under our Federal homestead law.

The bill would, in effect, give aid first to the farmer who already owns his own farm home, but who has over it a farm mortgage debt which he is unable to pay. It first rehabilitates the family now living on the farm. It then opens up for private entry by other families homestead tracts that are not now available.

Some of those in high places in our Government who seem intent upon destroying our free institutions and substituting a bureaucracy have for many years been familiar with my efforts and when I introduced this measure several years ago they had already laid the ground work of opposition by inspiring many honest, sincere Members of this House with the thought that this proposal is visionary, impractical, and tremendously extravagant. Such is not the case and I regret that some of my colleagues have fallen for this bait before taking the time to really study the provisions of this proposal and its practical operations.

This is by far the most economical, the simplest, and the most effective approach to this vital problem.

With a sum equal to less than two-thirds of the amount of the taxes that Congress has just canceled, under a program of this nature the rural population of America can be rehabilitated on an absolutely self-sustaining basis and the understructure of a sound domestic economy can be firmly established.

May I state to you briefly how it would operate? Suppose there is a farmer in your district who owns 1,000 acres of land and who now lives on that farm. He has a mortgage on the farm for \$6,000. It is evident that the farmer and his family alone cannot operate this entire acreage which means, of course, that they must have tenants living on the farm with them or else they must employ hired labor. The farmer finds that he is not able to operate the farm and at the same time pay the \$6,000 debt. He is faced with a mortgage foreclosure and he loses all his 1,000 acres, which includes his own home, because he is unable to make the required payments.

Under this measure this farmer may apply to the General Land Office for help. The General Land Office will then proceed to appraise the farm and if it is found that the mortgage of \$6,000 is not in excess of the value of the entire 1,000 acres, the General Land Office may purchase the mortgage and gain complete title and absolute possession of the 1,000 acres.

The General Land Office will then divide this 1,000 acres into proper size farm homestead tracts. Each homestead will contain such acreage as is necessary for the support of an average size farm family under normal conditions in the particular locality where the farm is located. Let us assume that in this instance a homestead will contain 100

acres. The General Land Office would then proceed to divide this 1,000-acre tract into 10 homestead tracts of 100 acres each and to charge against each of these 10 homestead tracts its pro rata share of the indebtedness of \$6,000. Assuming that each of the 10 homestead tracts was of equal value, the debt charged against each of them would be \$600.

The farmer who originally owned the 1,000 acres would then be permitted to choose for himself one of these 10 homestead tracts, and he would be given title to this tract of 100 acres but would be required to pay the indebtedness on this tract (\$600) over a period of not more than 40 years. The other 9 homestead tracts would be held by the General Land Office and be made available for entry on the same terms by other families.

Thus it can be seen that by this simple procedure this farmer would not have to lose his farm home and be reduced to a state of tenantry, but would be able to cut down his holdings to the size of a homestead tract which he could operate himself. At the same time nine other families would be permitted to gain ownership and possession of a farm homestead which they likewise can own for themselves as a home and can operate themselves.

This is the very heart and essence of this legislation. You can see that it does not have one element of communism or of bureaucracy in it. It does not contain one element of paternalistic control. And it does not in any way take from the individual or his family any of their rights or liberties. On the other hand, it regains for these individuals and these families their rights and their liberties, and protects them in the earning of their own livelihood through the sweat of their brow while living in their own farm home.

There are provisions in this measure which will further protect these family units by preventing the further mortgaging of any tract of land coming under its provisions until the owner has paid fully the debt owed to the United States Government.

There are other provisions of the bill which would permit the General Land Office when it is determined that the land involved or any portion of it was submarginal to retain such submarginal land as a part of the public domain. The reason for this is very evident. If a plot of land is not capable of sustaining a family certainly it is absurd to encourage a family to gain possession of such a piece of land in the hope of making a living for themselves.

In my opinion this measure strikes at the very heart of the problem of farm home ownership and provides a modern application of our national homestead laws to this great national problem.

Every penny of the funds appropriated for this purpose will be backed by the finest collateral on earth, the soil of the United States of America, so that not one penny of this money will be lost to the taxpayer of America.

One of the most important features of this legislation is that it places in one agency of the Government, the General

Land Office of the Department of the Interior, the function of providing opportunity for families to secure homes for themselves. At the same time it leaves in another altogether separate and distinct agency of the Government, the Department of Agriculture, the function of assisting in land practices. And it is only by completely divorcing these two avenues of Federal assistance that we can be sure of preventing encroachment upon the rights and liberties of those to whom the Government is lending aid and assistance.

This is the only proposal before the American people, and insofar as I know, the only proposal which has been made to the American people since I have been in Congress which again makes available for entry by those desiring farm homes vast areas of farm land without imposing upon the farm land or upon the farm population one additional penny of debt in any form, and which grants this opportunity without carrying with it any element of communism or paternalistic bureaucracy.

I realize that at present the primary duty of Congress is to do everything within its power to win the war. At the same time I call your attention to the fact that after this war is over, and some day it will be over, the American people will turn again to the normal way of living, and it is most important that we have ready for that day a domestic program which will take care of our people and help them in the preservation of their liberties and their rights while gaining for themselves an honest living by the sweat of their brow.

Millions of boys who are now fighting on our far-flung battlefields will some day come back home. Many of them will be crippled for life. All of them will have the right to expect from their country an opportunity to earn a decent living, and more than ever, we are going to have to turn again to the soil of this Nation for a means of livelihood.

The Government cannot go on forever supporting the people, but it is a duty of the Government to provide the opportunity for its people to support themselves.

It has been a policy of this Nation through the years to grant to the men of our armed forces lands, bounties, or homesteads, and while the methods pursued may not always have been perfect this has, in my opinion, been a very sound basic policy.

This legislation which I am proposing will not only rehabilitate the families now living on farms, but it will also provide homes and means of livelihood for the men now in our armed forces and for other deserving American families.

At the same time, it will prove a tremendous factor in stabilizing the family life of our people, strengthening the moral fabric of our country, and making all of us more secure in our rights, our freedom, and our liberties.

This measure is now before the Public Lands Committee of the House and I hope that we may be successful in getting early and favorable consideration of it by the committee and by this body; for this, in my opinion, is good, sound

legislation based upon good, old-fashioned American common sense, and it offers a program that will be free of the elements of bureaucracy, communism, and paternalism, and all other new theories that are so foreign to the traditions and principles of our great people, and so destructive of our rights, our liberty, and our independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on House Resolution 98, authorizing the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate grade labeling, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] had this to say:

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has made some investigation along the lines of this resolution as it relates to the grade labeling of canned goods. There were a number of witnesses before the committee and I think I should at this time for the sake of the record, repeat to the House the statement of one of the witnesses before the committee. Witness was Mr. Carson, who represents the great co-op organization in the Nation. He stated that his organization had recently purchased a cannery in the State of Missouri. That after taking over the cannery, they made an analysis of the operation of the cannery during the year 1942, and they found that during the year 1942 this cannery had paid for empty cans \$36,000 more than the farmers were paid for all the farm commodities that went into the cans. Let me repeat that: The empty cans cost \$36,000 more than all the farmers received for the products that went into the cans. Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are those who seem to take delight in charging that all of the increased cost of living today was brought on by those who toil in the fields, from daylight to dark, and to whom we must look for our food.

I have profound respect and high personal regard for our distinguished colleague from the great Southland. The gentleman from Georgia, Representative PACE, is an outstanding Member of this House and is tireless in his efforts for the farmers of the entire United States. I regret exceedingly his absence today. I telephoned the Congressman's office but he is away on official business. My reactions to Mr. PACE's statement are first, he has an idea that the steel and can manufacturers are making enormous profits and second, the returns to the canners are out of all proportion to the amount which the farmer gets for his products. In my district in San Francisco are located headquarters of many California canning and can-making companies as well as headquarters for the one concern on the Pacific coast manufacturing tin plate. In San Jose, close to my district, is located the outstanding manufacturing establishment making canning machinery. Processing of foods means much to California. In justice to the good people of my State, I desire to correct the impressions which apparently are in Mr. PACE's mind. In my opinion most canners, can manufacturers and steel producers are really not making exorbitant profits. As a matter of fact, I know of many firms that have had stormy and, in certain cases, disastrous financial careers in becoming established in these three fields. As far

as the manufacture of tin plate is concerned it is only within the last few years that the Columbia Steel Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, has commenced the manufacture of tin plate. Previously all the tin plate used in California was brought in from eastern tin plate mills, and at present the local mill does not supply the entire local consumption. Although tin plate is manufactured in but few States—California, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia—demand has expanded enormously. Whereas in 1923 tin plate accounted for only 3.6 percent of the finished rolled steel produced in this country, since 1932 it has taken nearly 9 percent of the total output. Visualize if you please the tens of thousands of persons given additional employment. Visualize further the new wealth created in America from this healthy industry.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from San Francisco.

Mr. WELCH. Is my colleague aware of the fact that the United States Steel Corporation limits the output of steel by the Columbia Steel Co., its subsidiary, whose plant is located at Pittsburg, Calif., to 10 percent of the tin plate used by the canneries in the State of California?

Mr. ROLPH. I had no idea that it was limited to 10 percent. That should be changed and corrected at once.

Mr. WELCH. The United States Steel Corporation put a limit on the output of steel by the Columbia Steel Co., its subsidiary, of 10 percent of the tin plate used by the canneries in the State of California.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank my colleague for his observation.

May I take this opportunity of congratulating my colleague on the very splendid work he has been doing in trying to establish a large steel output on the Pacific coast. I commend him, and I think he deserves a great deal of credit.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Commenting on the statement made that the canners are making exorbitant profits, just recently the Michigan delegation met with the Michigan canners, who showed conclusively that they could not absorb in their share of the profit on canned goods an increase of 15 percent in wages which they were asked by the administration to grant. They showed clearly that it could not be done.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman means under the ceiling prices?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; their margin was too small to permit it.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much for his observation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have no particular reason to defend the gentleman from Georgia any more than that I

have been on the committee with him for several years, but I think the gentleman from California has possibly misinterpreted what the gentleman from Georgia tried to point out. I think what the gentleman from Georgia did try to point out in the hearings, which I attended, was that the product itself represented a small part of the cost of canned goods. Further, I am sure the gentleman realizes that not only the amount of material that is available but also the ceiling that has been placed on his people must be taken into consideration, and that, therefore, they are not making exorbitant profits. I think the gentleman from Georgia is cognizant of that fact because at the present time they are not in a position to overcharge for their tin plate.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much indeed for his observation. May I say that I do not think that for many years the price of tin plate has been out of line with the resale price of canned goods. That is the impression I want to correct, because it means much to the industry, to my district, and to my State.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I wish to thank the gentleman from California for throwing some light on this question because the canners are a very important outlet for the products of our farmers. I am under the impression, however, and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, that the American Can Corporation and the Continental Can Corporation control most of the available cans for use by the canners of this country. Because of this dominant position, and because a system of leasing, they control all the machinery. Thus does the cost of cans become a large, fixed cost not always in proper ratio to other factors. Am I in error in that statement?

Mr. ROLPH. As I understand, the American Can Co. and the Continental Can Co. are the dominant factors in the can-making business, but there are other concerns. Of course, not nearly as large as those companies. However, I would say that those two concerns do dominate a large percentage of the business in this country.

Mr. HORAN. I have understood that that is one of the big factors in the overhead cost of running a cannery.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman does not mean running a cannery, he means running a can-making plant.

Mr. HORAN. In operating a cannery, where you have to figure in labor, the cost of raw materials, the cost of canning, the cost of machinery leases, and a few other costs, all of which have to be repaid in the end from the sale price to the consumer, the fixed costs, such as the cost of the cans and the leasing of the machinery, become burdensome out of all proportion when canned goods have to be sold in poor markets, anemic markets such as we have had. The cost of labor and raw materials from the farms are the main movable margins

going into that operation that can absorb the losses. The canners have to hold the sack and be responsible for the salability of that product, naturally they are subject to some unjust criticism by a public not always cognizant of all the facts.

Mr. ROLPH. I have figures I shall submit later giving the relative costs per can of certain products. In my opinion, they are not exorbitant, particularly due to the fact that if these goods were not canned they would go to waste.

Standard abstract of the United States for the year 1940, House Document 976, page 670 shows the value of farm crops in California as being about \$350,000,000. The national total was some \$3,600,000,000, or, in other words, California produced approximately 10 percent of the farm products of the entire Republic. The question arises as to what percentage of the country's fruit and vegetable crops is canned. Upon taking the matter up with the National Canners Association, I find that only 10 varieties make up the great bulk of canned vegetables. These are asparagus, beans, beets, carrots, corn, peas, pumpkin, spinach, squash, tomatoes. Considering these for the year 1942, 67 percent of the total United States production was canned and the other 33 percent was offered for sale on the fresh market. I also asked what percentage of these crops would be lost if they were not processed. While no definite statistics are available, you can well imagine that it would be utterly impossible to dispose of such large quantities of fruits and vegetables on the fresh market. The offerings could not be promptly absorbed when ripe and unless the products were processed and preserved, financial loss from spoilage would be ruinous. Importance of canned fruits and vegetables to the national economy is well indicated by percentages on a money-value basis. While we have no comparison between the canned and fresh-market values, still the value of all canned fruit and vegetables amounted to about \$1,600,000,000 last year. The industry contributes to the economy of practically every State in the country as well as to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Actually there are only three States, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Nevada, which do not sustain plants canning either fruits or vegetables. At the peak of the season about one-half million people are employed; at the low point about 100,000. At the peak of the season—September 1—last year, those on the pay roll totaled some 325,000 persons. Not included are employees working in factories canning other items such as fish, baked beans, and so forth, in other words, winter-packed products. At present lack of manpower is a most serious problem and one which is causing every company deep concern. Efforts are being made to get high school students as well as women to take the places of men who formerly worked in canneries and who are now entering many branches of the service or in war industries.

Now, referring particularly to tin plate. This is an industry requiring enormous capital investments. For instance, a new steel company has recently started at Fontana, Calif. I understand the outlay is well over a hundred million dollars. The plant will be practically self-contained, having company-owned sources of ore and coal. The concern will roll plates, bars, and structural shapes but no tin plate. If sheet rolling equipment is added it will take additional large expenditures.

At this point I want particularly to stress that all the pig tin used in this country is imported. The principal sources of supply before the war were the Far East, Bolivia, and South America. A small quantity, about 60 tons, comes from Alaska. Our annual consumption is about 75,000 gross tons. At present we are importing a certain quantity of pig tin and also ore from South America. Ore is being smelted in a plant in Texas. From figures recently released returns on the securities of American steel companies have been low, indeed. One of the principal hazards in the steel industry is the constant development of improved methods and processes which necessitate constant buying of new equipment. Obsolescence is particularly rapid. Steel companies are exceptionally large units, and steel making is involved and highly technical. Research for improved methods is going on at all times.

In 1938, the container industry ranked third among consuming industries of steel, accounting for 9.1 percent of the total production of finished steel. The upward trend and increasing importance of the container industry as a consumer of steel can be seen from the following table:

Estimated consumption of steel by the container industry, 1923-38

Year	Consumption of hot-rolled iron and steel (thousands of gross tons)	Percent of total hot-rolled steel production
1923	1,265	3.6
1924	1,210	4.3
1925	1,427	4.3
1926	1,348	3.8
1927	1,408	4.3
1928	1,619	4.3
1929	1,707	4.2
1930	1,670	5.7
1931	1,415	7.4
1932	1,037	9.9
1933	1,759	10.5
1934	1,557	8.2
1935	2,039	8.5
1936	2,455	7.3
1937	2,874	7.8
1938	1,908	9.1

Source: Computed by apportioning individual hot-rolled product totals on the basis of Iron Age distribution reports and by allocating jobber shipments to ultimate consumers. See M. W. Worthing, *The Distribution of Steel Products to Major Consuming Industries*, United States Steel Corporation, Oct. 30, 1939.

Can-making companies are comparatively few. In testimony before the Temporary National Economic Committee in November 1939, Dr. H. A. Baker,

president, American Can Co., was asked by Acting Chairman King:

How many companies manufacture cans?

Dr. Baker's answer:

Food can manufacturers: The American Can Co., Continental Can Co., National Can Co., Owens-Illinois Can Co., Crown Can Co., Phillips Can Co., Heekin Can Co., Pacific Can Co., and Heinz Co. In the milk-packing field practically all of the large canners of milk make their own cans, such as Borden, Pet, Carnation, and so on. In the general line of manufacture of tin containers, I believe there are something over 50 small companies in that field.

Principal reason for this condition is that equipment for making cans is special and intricate, requiring huge investments. Furthermore, sales resistance is acute because makers of cans are particularly rigid in writing specifications and after a connection is once established customers are loath to change. For this reason it is difficult for new firms to enter the field. On the other hand, the canning companies are many. I quote from Monograph No. 35 on the subject of Large Scale Organization in the Food Industries. On page 51, we read, as follows:

The canning of fruits and vegetables is an industry composed of many individual firms. There are, in the industry, at least a dozen big corporations operating chains of canneries and the tendency during the last 20 years has been definitely toward the growth and expansion of such firms. On the Pacific coast, concentration of corporate control has reached the point where two or three organizations pack over half the total supply of the canning crops produced in that region. But in most other parts of the country the industry is still characterized by relatively large numbers of independent canning firms.

The two outstanding corporations in the canning industry are the California Packing Corporation and Libby, McNeill & Libby. Dollar sales of the California Packing Corporation amounted in 1937 to over \$61,000,000, those of Libby to well over \$74,000,000 (chart VIII). No other canning firm has anything like the volume of business done by these two organizations.

The California Packing Corporation was incorporated in 1916 to consolidate the interests of four firms operating in California and other Pacific Coast States. These four firms themselves previously had bought or otherwise acquired a number of smaller canning companies. Following its organization, the California Packing Corporation expanded its operations to other sections of the country, notably by the acquisition of the Midwest Canning Corporation, with plant facilities in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and other Midwestern States. In addition to its operations within the United States, the company is a large factor in the growing and canning of Hawaiian pineapple. It also engages in salmon packing, fruit drying, and coffee manufacturing. Some of the produce which it packs is grown on its own ranches and land holdings. Like most other big food processors, the corporation has built up its own sales organization for distributing its products and does not use jobbers and brokers as do the smaller canners.

Libby, McNeill & Libby was developed as a subsidiary of the meat-packing firm of Swift & Co. As previously described, the meat packers agreed under the consent decree of 1920 to give up their interests in the canning of fruits and vegetables, and since that

time Libby, McNeill & Libby has operated as a nominally independent concern. It had been brought to the status of a large organization while still under the control of Swift, and has grown comparatively little during the last 10 or 15 years.

In set-up and method of operation, Libby, McNeill & Libby is similar to the California Packing Corporation. It, too, is engaged in the canning business on a national scale and carries on many related enterprises. In addition to the canning of fruits and vegetables, it packs salmon, meat, pineapple, and other tropical fruits.

There are at least a dozen other canning companies, which operate sizable chains of canneries, have their own brands and sales organizations, and conduct their businesses along the lines already described for Libby, McNeill & Libby and California Packing Corporation. Most of these companies have developed since the World War and represent a definite change in an industry formerly comprised almost entirely of small firms.

The story of the manufacture of tin plate is one of the romances of the steel industry. As long ago as 55 B. C. the early Romans coated copper vessels with tin to make them suitable for use as containers for food and drink. They secured tin from mines in Cornwall. The first tin plate industry as such is supposed to have started in Bohemia about 1240 A. D. Up to 1620 there is no record of tin plate being made elsewhere, for its manufacture was carried on with the utmost secrecy and the art was passed down from father to son.

Little further was heard of tin plate until 1720 when a plant was established at Pontypool in Monmouth, under the management of Maj. John Hanbury. It was during operations at that plant that Hanbury and Payne, in 1728, perfected the manufacture of thin iron sheets by rolling and thus assured the success of their industry.

Up to 1875 nearly all tin plate had iron for a base. There were two grades produced, charcoal iron made with charcoal alone as a fuel, and coke iron made with a mixture of charcoal and coke. The charcoal iron was the better product and plates made from it generally carried an extra heavy coating of tin.

By 1880 steel sheets or plates had been generally substituted for iron sheets in the manufacture of tin plate. Today the most modern equipment known to steel manufacture is used in the production of tin plate. In spite of that, however, to produce 1 ton of tin plate, requires about 58 man-hours of labor in a steel mill, or more than any other finished rolled product.

The method of producing tin plate by making the final reduction in the thickness of the steel while it is cold, rather than at red heat, is a rather recent advancement. Cold reduction makes steel hard and brittle and it must be annealed, treated by heat, to make it soft and ductile. To anneal the plates they are stacked in huge boxes which are placed in enormous ovens and subjected to a temperature of about 1400° F. for 16 to 18 hours. When the boxes are withdrawn from the furnace they are

allowed to cool to atmospheric temperature, which takes from 40 to 48 hours.

Annealing has enlarged the pores of the steel, and if tinned without further processing, the plate would absorb too much tin and would not present a bright, silvery appearance. To overcome this difficulty the plates are passed through another set of cold rolls, which produce a dense, polished surface on both sides which again flattens them, but without hardening and without brittleness. The plates are then carefully inspected for surface defects, accuracy to size and gage, flatness; and those which pass inspection are sent to the tinning department. Here they are coated with a flux of zinc chloride or ammonium chloride, which removes any dirt, grease, or perspiration stains and prepares the surface for its coating of tin. The plates must be as clean and as mechanically perfect as is humanly possible.

The plates are next immersed in a bath of molten tin protected from the atmosphere by a layer of palm oil. This serves to keep the tin from solidifying too rapidly and to assure an even coating of high luster. The plate is drawn out of the tin by rolls, which strip off the excess tin and distribute the remainder evenly over the surface. After cleaning and polishing, the plates are graded by carefully trained inspectors, who examine each plate minutely on both sides for defects. Their skill becomes more apparent when it is known that there may be 17 major defects, any one of which would bar a plate from being classed as a "prime," a tin plate with no defects discernible to the naked eye.

Last year—1942—the tin mills of the United States produced almost 2,658,000 net tons of tin plate.

Year by year since 1890 the production of tin plate has mounted higher and higher in an almost unbroken chain of advance. In that year there was no tin plate produced in the United States. All that was used here was imported from Wales, and so great was Welsh supremacy because of low labor costs, that earlier tin-plate enterprises launched in 1873 and 1874 could not withstand the pressure of the competition, and by 1878 had ceased production.

The growing importance of tin plate in American home life and the urgency of a home industry led to insertion of a clause relative to tin plate in the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890. The levy was 2.2 cents per pound on imported tin plate. Provision was made, however, that if after October 1, 1897, American manufacturers had not produced in any 1 fiscal year as much as one-third of the quantity of tin plate imported, the tin plate clause of the act would become nonoperative.

Almost overnight American enterprise met the challenge. By the end of 1891 there were 20 tin mills in operation and 10 under construction. At the close of 1897 there were 69 mills in operation and 7 projected. American manufacturers once again demonstrated their ability.

American ingenuity may always be relied on to meet any issue.

Cans made from tin plate have perhaps played the foremost role in transforming marketing of foodstuffs from a local to a Nation-wide industry.

In war, the tin can has proved invaluable. The immense problems of supplying our fighting forces on all the many battle fronts is made possible by canned foods. Tin plate deserves to be ranked along with rails, structural steel and the other steel products as an outstanding contribution to civilization. Tin plate is an important factor in maintaining high standards of living. Of interest are the unit costs of tin cans to retail sales prices of certain products. On page 14022 of part 26 of the hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee in January 1940 we find these figures:

Commodity	Retail price (cents)	Estimated tin plate costs (cents)	Tin plate cost as proportion of retail price (percent)
1. Tomatoes, No. 2 standard.....	8.8	1.22	13.9
2. Beans and pork, No. 1.....	7.4	.88	11.8
3. Green beans, No. 2.....	11.2	1.22	10.9
4. Corn, No. 2 standard.....	11.6	1.22	10.5
5. Peas, No. 2 standard.....	15.1	1.22	8.1
6. Peaches, No. 2½ can.....	18.6	1.48	8.0
7. Pears, No. 2½ can.....	21.3	1.48	6.9
8. Pineapple, No. 2½ can.....	22.4	1.48	6.6
9. Pink salmon, 16-oz. can, tall.....	13.4	.87	6.5
10. Asparagus, No. 2 can.....	29.5	1.22	4.1
11. Canned salmon, 16-oz. can, tall.....	25.7	.87	3.4

Perhaps more intriguing than the story of tin plate is the history of commercial canning. What would happen in the present war effort without canned foods staggers one. Our fighting forces would absolutely be at a standstill without food in cans.

The history of canning goes back to the year 1795 when the French Government offered a prize of 12,000 francs for the discovery of a practical method of food preservation. France was in the grip of a revolution at home and at the same time was at war with several hostile European nations. Consequently, the need for adequate food supplies for her army and navy was acute. It was not until 1809, however, that a Parisian confectioner succeeded in preserving certain foods in especially made glass bottles which had been kept in boiling water for varying lengths of time. In the next year, 1810, his work was made known publicly in a treatise entitled "The Book for All Households or the Art of Preserving Animal Substances for Many Years." The underlying principle of the various methods of food preservation is basically the same; the development of conditions within a food—temporary or sustained—which are unfavorable for the growth of spoilage organisms. Thus, for example, if a food be chilled, heated, or desiccated, or if it be made excessively acid by some proper

means, it immediately becomes an unfavorable medium for the development of micro-organisms. In commercial canning, carefully prepared raw food contained in a sealed container is subjected to definite elevated temperatures for the proper period of time and then cooled. Heating the contents of the can produces an unfavorable temperature environment for spoilage organisms which may be present in the food; consequently such organisms are destroyed and their growth inhibited. The permanently sealed can then prevents reinfection of the food by spoilage organisms present in the air. This is the basic principle of commercial canning. The industry was first introduced in the United States from England about 1820, and the first American establishments were set up in Boston and New York. The phenomenal growth of the industry in the United States and throughout the world in the last hundred years may be attributed—aside from the scientific approach—to the development of, first, the art of container manufacture of both tin cans and glass jars and bottles; second, the canning processes themselves; and, third, canning machinery.

The United States has become the greatest producer and consumer of canned foods in the world. The present-day tin can, which is 98.5 percent of sheet steel with a thin coating of tin, is manufactured on wholly automatic lines of machinery at a rate in excess of 300 cans per minute. In contrast, in can-manufacturing operations a little over a generation ago, a skilled artisan could make 600 cans in a 10-hour day. The improvement of the tin can as the cheapest and most serviceable container for mass production is marked by the advent of the sanitary, or open-top can, about 1905-08. This development answered many of the canner's practical problems by eliminating the use of solder in sealing the can and a perfect closure was guaranteed by the double-seamed top and bottom. In a typical year, the industry uses 10,000,000,000 tin cans for the Nation's harvest. California is listed in the 1937 census as having 406 establishments, the great proportion of which would be fruit canneries situated near the orchards. Other geographical areas are noted for a specialty, that is, Hawaii for pineapple, Alaska for salmon, and so forth. As far as the nutritive aspects of canned foods are concerned, modern canning practices embody procedures and methods designed to protect the vitamin and mineral content of the food. Canned foods, whether in tin or glass, are as safe and wholesome as similar foods prepared for the table by the best home methods.

Referring again to the investigation of concentration of economic power, conducted by the Temporary National Economic Committee, we find in monograph No. 23 brochure on agriculture and the

national economy the following on page 23:

As far as the national market is concerned, concentration of control has not progressed very far in the canning of fruits and vegetables except for certain specialized crops. Of much more importance to the farmer is the concentration of buying power in local markets which is represented by the canning companies. In order to assure themselves of adequate supplies, canning companies cannot afford to locate their factories too close to each other. In consequence, there is often only one canner and at the most usually not more than three or four to whom the farmer can conveniently haul his produce. As a result competition in buying is between the canner and the fresh market rather than among the canners themselves.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. CREAL. I have no reason to differ with anything the gentleman has said, but as he rather took his text from what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] said, and like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], I was present in the committee, and also heard Mr. PACE. I do not think that he meant any reflection upon the tin business or its production or anything like that. He was merely illustrating one point, that the farmer gets so little of the consumer's dollar, which he pays for the product. That is so little comes to the farmer, who is the actual producer in the first instance. Mr. PACE merely mentioned that as a general item, the package in which the food is found cost more than the food itself.

Mr. ROLPH. I was particularly conscious of that.

Mr. CREAL. I do not think that he even gave that one thought any more than anything else, as, for instance, we talk about \$12 for a ton of cabbages that retail for about \$500 a ton. I do not think that he had any idea in any of his talk of any kind of an attack at the tin-can business.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much. I am very delighted that Mr. PACE has given me the opportunity to bring this out. I am sure Mr. PACE will also be glad to have the whole proposition discussed in this way.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise to compliment the gentleman from California on his presentation of one of the other phases of the total production of food. This whole productive process is a very complicated one in our modern economic world.

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Frequently we have a too narrow definition of who is an economic producer. I represent a farming community, and naturally I am thinking of the first producer, who gets the raw product out of the soil. Naturally I think the farmer gets too small a proportion of the total amount paid

by the consumer, but the tin-can producer, the steel manufacturer, the middle men, and the transportation agencies are all in the production picture nevertheless. As to the relative part of the total cost each production factor should receive there is a considerable disagreement. I think it would be well for most of us to take a course in truly scientific economics, to determine just what is the relative share of each producer of what the consumer pays.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes, gladly.

Mr. HORAN. I am very glad that the gentleman brought out the whole picture of the canning industry. In the matter of wastage of food, I might say that we had our whole pear crop ready one year, boxed for the market, but we could not sell it. That was in 1931; so we took them out of cold storage and shipped them to a cannery and had them canned on our own account. We learned something about the canning business. There is the matter of the fixed and the adjustable cost factors, and it is not a simple thing when we get into the matter of an anemic market to have some costs absorb all of the losses.

Mr. ROLPH. I feel grateful to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ROLPH. Certainly.

Mr. GEARHART. As one who hails from a district in which one of the greatest canning operations in the world is carried on, a district in which there are iron deposits in great abundance, iron deposits which, it is hoped, will be developed in the near future, I am especially interested in both phases of the gentleman's discussion.

For his lucid explanation of a very complex subject, one which is of great concern to city dwellers and ruralites alike, we all owe the gentleman from California a definite debt of gratitude. I deem it a privilege to be able to arise to compliment the gentleman on his splendid effort.

Mr. ROLPH. I thank the gentleman, and I am sure he will be specially interested in the remarks of my address which I am about to give in conclusion.

California is proud of her outstanding role in developing superior qualities in canned goods. California is proud for contributing so greatly to the food supply of the entire world. California is proud of her far-flung canning industry including grower, processor, distributor, and those who deliver our products.

Mr. Speaker, California thanks you and the Members of Congress for your aid in developing Central Valley. When water from Central Valley flows on additional irrigated lands in the Golden State we will provide foods in still greater abundance.

Recent canned food production figures in the United States

[Figures given are in case lots (1 dozen to a case)]

	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
FRUITS					
Apples	2,584,162	2,331,581	2,620,373	2,672,328	1,755,621
Applesauce	1,892,187	1,887,256	2,353,250	3,161,001	1,526,551
Apricots	2,075,631	3,332,814	2,982,467	5,727,996	1,729,496
Blackberries	746,391	486,651	596,341	493,218	534,248
Raspberries	531,098	517,746	388,584	623,564	319,287
Cherries, red pitted	1,855,045	2,562,683	1,450,335	2,471,082	1,694,815
Cherries, sweet	526,162	535,393	569,785	518,979	730,232
Grapefruit	2,398,352	3,747,822	2,410,904	4,270,240	3,654,697
Grapefruit juice	739,844	2,556,124	2,235,699	6,016,240	8,021,828
Peaches	8,036,335	11,746,634	11,509,593	13,092,140	10,401,016
Pears	6,163,362	4,766,874	6,104,365	5,115,962	4,848,090
Plums	206,856	152,016	116,040	288,532	70,086
Prunes	1,130,785	1,767,457	1,891,364	1,697,271	634,987
Grapes	136,812	105,998	108,067	121,859	93,532
Figs	222,670	216,550	313,930	412,481	260,299
Pineapple (Hawaiian)	9,000,000	10,000,000	12,000,000	12,500,000	10,000,000
Pineapple juice (Hawaiian)	2,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	7,500,000	6,000,000
Fruit salad	1,381,724	1,340,547	1,465,186	1,256,492	938,455
Fruit cocktail	1,167,851	1,649,907	2,156,808	3,152,313	1,941,814
Strawberries	108,676	181,057	133,205	126,051	94,860
Loganberries	352,645	225,576	164,643	66,078	195,786
Gooseberries	34,471	49,549	57,379	57,195	47,287
Blueberries and huckleberries		212,488	252,138	441,988	185,009
Orange juice	342,678	1,107,299	1,227,186	1,646,059	1,806,183
Lemon juice		100,000	300,000	352,422	425,000
VEGETABLES					
Asparagus	2,149,131	2,519,958	2,790,994	2,703,966	2,403,214
Beans:					
Green	5,157,128	6,031,152	5,675,399	8,681,119	9,108,933
Lima	1,280,812	1,133,776	1,512,737	1,449,040	1,863,486
Wax	1,143,234	1,129,955	954,070	1,370,724	1,806,064
Beets	2,196,116	2,461,768	2,490,250	3,210,403	3,170,207
Carrots				940,480	703,655
Corn	11,267,807	21,471,417	14,621,189	23,541,224	20,469,518
Peas	15,741,569	24,698,633	16,552,816	23,467,479	25,458,647
Pumpkin and squash	1,381,424	833,355	1,767,847	1,507,708	1,195,177
Spinach	3,602,131	4,318,001	4,143,167	6,136,051	2,883,106
Tomatoes	22,376,349	26,984,042	24,208,740	26,076,094	22,960,184
Tomato juice	5,703,920	9,286,590	13,104,809	13,444,972	8,942,894
MILKS					
Evaporated and condensed milk	40,779,724	43,535,000	48,122,230	44,371,057	

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a resolution passed in Fremont, Nebr., November 17, at a meeting of 700 livestock producers; also a letter from B. A. Gronstal, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, relative to the roll-back and subsidy payments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein a reply on the part of Mr. Aubrey Williams, of the National Youth Administration, in which he lists more than one hundred manufacturing companies who commend the work of the National Youth Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER BY GRADE LABELING CANNED FOODS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, two major problems face our Nation today—the winning of the war and the protection of the domestic economy at home.

The greatest foe to the domestic economy is the threat of inflation, which will

affect the standard of health and the general welfare of 130,000,000 people. There are many facets to the problem of inflation, and I wish to speak today on the one facet of protecting the consumer by grade labeling canned foods.

The subject of protecting the consumer is one which will never be exhausted. The development of quality standards has been taking place in every line of endeavor since commerce and trade began. For many years the phrase "caveat emptor"—let the buyer beware—was the banner under which all commerce was carried on. All types of fraud and deception, lying, cheating, and adulterating were considered smart business. An accompanying principle was the "let the public be damned" in public relations of the businessman to his customer.

As civilization advanced, however, certain of these principles began to lose their former adherents and there grew up in the guild world a pride of workmanship, denoted in most instances by the attaching of the name of the craftsman to his product. Upon this high standard, quality product, which proudly bore the name of its creator, there developed a demand for this particular article greater than its shoddy or cheapened competitive article—and let me say right here that I believe in the competitive system. I believe in the pride of individual creation. I believe in the preservation of the brand names and the protection of the owners of those brand

names in their built-up equity therein, insofar as it does not work a hardship upon society as a whole, or become a detriment to the health of our people.

Let us go back to the passage of the Pure Food and Drugs Act in 1906. The same arguments that are used against quality designation or grade labeling today were used against the passage of this act, which is now considered one of the best protective acts the consumer enjoys. Would it have been wise at that time, because there were a few large manufacturers of drugs who kept faith with their consumers and sold their drugs under a brand name, to have refused to pass an act which would compel their unscrupulous competitors to employ the same safe standards and the same purity standards to their product?

I realize that those who held a high standard for their products were in the minority when considered in the aggregate, that a majority of the drugs the people were buying did not come up to standards of purity and quality. Therefore, for the benefit of the consuming public as a whole, we extended to them the protection against those unscrupulous or substandard-drug manufacturers. I, of course, realize that the Pure Food and Drugs Act does not completely cover the field. I realize that continuous investigation and in many instances prosecution, is necessary to protect the consuming public, and if I had time I could show you many cases which I have here in my file as late as the years 1942 and 1943 where indictments have been issued against manufacturers for transgressions of this act. This will continue to be the case as long as there are two principles—the principles of right and wrong in this world.

We have had a more recent protective law passed, known as the truth in fabrics bill. If I may be pardoned for referring to my own experience of some 20 years in the handling of fabric merchandise, I can say that, as a retailer, I welcomed this partially protective law, as protecting not only the consuming public but as a protection to the legitimate retail merchant against unscrupulous competitors. You will notice that I said "partially" protective. I realize the fact that this law applies chiefly to all-wool or part-wool fabrics. I realize that the law has its weak spots and is inadequate to fully cover the field of consumer protection.

In my research work on this subject, I enjoyed very much the book *Fables in Labels*, which was written by the respected chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Subcommittee, Congressman BOREN. I might say that I agree almost in entirety with his treatise on this subject. The information contained therein, I can verify from 20 years of experience in the purchasing and selling of fabrics and I wish to quote from page 64, of this book a fundamental moral principle which I believe is at stake in this phase of the grade-labeling program, along with all other legislation which is

planned for the protection of the great mass of our people:

Government with the aid of its laboratories and specification writers, has been able to judge quality and to take advantage of the best possible value at the lowest possible price. Is the ultimate consumer to be deprived of this same advantage?

I believe that if the Government finds it to its interest to apply performance standards to its purchases, such information should be made available to the consumer.

As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] has stated here, the known fact that the Government has been able to set up standards of quality and "take advantage of the best possible value at the lowest possible price" and he further questions, "Is the ultimate consumer to be deprived of this same advantage?" And then he answers this question. I quote again: "I believe that if the Government finds it to its interest to apply performance standards to its purchases, such information should be available to the consumer," and this very simply and completely put is the reason that I request this protection for the civilian consumer.

The Government long ago established certain specifications, both as to content and performance, which had to be met by those who had supplies they wished to sell to the Government. The fact that these specifications had to be met by the suppliers of Government matériel has not discouraged competitive bidders. The record will prove that there has always been a sufficient number of bidders who found it profitable to supply the Government according to these specifications, and I challenge anyone to state that our boys in the armed forces have not received better equipment and food-stuffs as a result of this method of protective purchasing. Incidentally, I might state here that every can of edible food-stuff which is sold to the Government—and that runs into millions of cases—must pass rigid tests of quality requirements and must be grade-labeled to show that they have met these requirements.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They require A. M. A. grading but not grade labeling.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The grade labeling is on the case.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. On the case but not on the can.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; of course not. No one is going to substitute adulterated cans in a case when the case is marked.

Some of the canners who furnish these quality products to the Government are opposing this grade-labeling program to the consumer for their own selfish reasons. This grade-labeling program is not opposed in its entirety, however, by the canners. There are many canners now who are voluntarily complying with United States Government standards or, more specifically, the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. One of the greatest retail chains of grocers in the United States, having some 3,000 retail outlets, has built up immense consumer acceptance on these principles. I have a

letter in my possession from this great chain, which says that not only are they satisfied with these A, B, C grades, but they are expanding the program to other products which they sell. Many canners in my own State of California are also complying voluntarily with the Agricultural Marketing Service standards.

As I stated before, I believe in brand protection. To those manufacturers who have built, by adhering to quality standards, a consumer acceptance of a particular brand, I believe they merit protection, but as a merchant with practical experience, I realize that this is not enough protection for the ultimate consumer for in my own experience I have known of the rise and fall of quality standards behind a specific brand. Any businessman will testify that this is a common occurrence. A company will build up a quality product. They will market it under a brand name, will popularize it with the consumer by a high-pressure advertising campaign. After a period of time, it has enormous consumer acceptance. Suddenly the article begins to deteriorate in quality. It may be due to financial difficulties of the firm, a change of ownership, a capitalization of the firm's earning power by overissuance of stock, or it may be through a deliberate policy of adulteration for the purpose of excessive profits.

Regardless of the reason, during the slide down the hill on the toboggan of declining quality standards, the consuming public is defrauded of millions of dollars in merchandise values. Therefore, I say to you that the brand name is not enough. It must be accompanied by a quality designation label to which the consumer may refer at any time as a measure of the value of the merchandise which he is purchasing. No legitimate canner should object to this. In my opinion, only those canners who are practicing deception or intend to perpetrate fraud upon the American people would object to this reasonable request. Any cry of socialism in regard to grade labeling is specious and for the purpose of beclouding the real issue of protecting the 130,000,000 consumers, robbery through deception, or withholding vital information.

I realize, of course, that the canners who are guilty of practicing deception or have intention to perpetrate fraud on the American people are in the minority when compared with the legitimate concerns. However, the illegitimate concerns and some of the legitimate concerns are raising the old cry of "Government interference with business," and claiming that grade-labeling regulations will cut down their profits and that they are now on the verge of bankruptcy.

I wish to call to your attention the cases of two great packing corporations which operate in my State of California. I do not know their attitude on grade labeling. I do have an analysis of their profits for the past 4 years, taken from the authoritative corporation records of Standard & Poor's Corporation reports. In the case of the California Packing Corporation, their deficit in 1939 was approximately two and one-half million dollars. Their profits for the years of

1940, 1941, and 1942 were approximately \$11,000,000. During the past year of 1942 their profits were \$4,893,122. In the case of Libby, McNeill & Libby, their deficit in 1939 was approximately three and one-half million dollars. In the 4 succeeding years, ending March 1, 1943, their profit was approximately \$13,000,000. In the present year of 1943 their profits were \$3,270,029.

Now, may I point out the fact during the past 3 or 4 years both of these companies have packed millions of cases of canned food for the use of our armed forces, each and every case conformed to quality specifications of the United States Government and was grade labeled accordingly? The records show that this protection which was extended to the boys in our armed forces was not a detriment to these great canning corporations, but, on the contrary, was a very profitable business arrangement. Here are the facts that substantiate my arguments that grade labeling is not a burden to the canner, and certainly the protection which has been extended to our boys in the armed forces should be extended to their mothers, wives, and babies at home.

If we agree then that the consumer should be protected from fraud in ordinary times, how much more necessary is it that he be protected during this time of food shortage, when the housewife is faced with the necessity of making every point in her ration book count?

Her failure to do this means substandard diet and the deterioration of the health of the members of her family. If she uses her precious points to purchase a can of food from the shelf of her grocer and then upon opening it she finds it is substandard in quality, she has not only been defrauded of her money, but due to the quota of ration points allowed her, she cannot replace it with a better quality of canned food. As there are thousands of brands, she may well make this mistake many times unless she can find a can which bears, beside the brand name, a quality designation mark.

I feel that the Members of this Congress owe a duty to every consumer in their districts today more than ever before, because of the point-rationing system. I believe that these laws should have been passed before now. I have been told that it is now too late to grade label the 1943 pack of canned goods. I am not in a position to judge the merit of this statement. If it is too late, I can say without fear of contradiction that the delay has been occasioned by the canners' lobbies who have opposed grade labeling for their own selfish reasons and have brought pressure to bear both within and without the Office of Price Administration.

If it is too late to label the 1943 pack, the public will pay the penalty for our dilatory procedures and I hope Halleck-Boren committee's findings will be such as to merit their recommendation that changes be made in the O. P. A. regulations or, better still, that proper legislation be brought before the Congress to enable us to extend the protection the consumers deserve into the field of canned foods.

If the time be too short for this protection to be applied to the 1943 pack, I am sure that by acting in an expeditious manner, we can extend this protection to the consumers of the 1944 pack.

I regret very much to see the attitude of the Republican bloc and their recruits from the Democratic side, as shown in their recent votes of June 18, in which they were successful in denying all funds to those departments charged with protecting the 130,000,000 consumers from fraud and deception. In so doing, it is my opinion, they have failed in this phase of the battle against inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES IS HEADED FOR A FOOD FAMINE NEXT WINTER

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the wintry blasts of next January will find the American people subsisting on roll-backs and subsidies instead of food, unless Congress acts at once to correct the damage now being done to food production and distribution by utopian schemers in the O. P. A. and other New Deal agencies.

When famine strikes home next winter in New York City and other large consuming areas, roll-backs and subsidies will not count. It will then be a question of getting food at any price, if it can be secured at all. Within 6 months, most legitimate food dealers will be out of business because of inability to secure supplies from food processors, and the black market will flourish in the handling of beef, pork, poultry, butter, eggs, vegetables, and other essential foods. Patriotic citizens who refuse to patronize the black market and pay outrageous prices will go hungry. Processors and manufacturers of food products are now being placed in a position by the O. P. A. so that they will only receive a small trickle of supplies to meet the demands from all sources. There is a question in my mind if they will be able to get enough supplies to take care of the requirements of our armed forces, to say nothing of lend-lease commitments.

After months of observation and daily argument with O. P. A. officials, I am convinced that these planners are not interested in securing a maximum production of food products. Can it be possible that these social and economic reformers in the New Deal desire to bring about a scarcity in food and chaos in the processing and distribution of it, as an excuse for them to take over in every field and give the American people what is called a "socialistic new order." It looks that way to me.

I do not blame Prentiss Brown for the mistakes of the O. P. A. He inherited Henderson's clique, consisting of hundreds of inexperienced policy makers who operate from blueprints. With the exception of eating food, most of them have not had 1 day's experience in the production, processing, or distribution of products for human or animal consumption. To appease the American people, the administration has discharged two

or three of these supermen like Ginsberg and Galbraith, but, by and large the administration continues to appoint men of the same caliber to take their places.

It appears that the administration does not want men of experience to handle the food problem. Intellectual schemers within the New Deal are now doing their best to discredit Chester Davis, one of the few men in administration circles who has the practical experience and knows the answers on the food problem. He has been hamstrung at every turn. He was called to Washington to solve the problem, only to find that New Deal schemers in the O. P. A. retained the whip hand in the formulation of food policies.

Chester Davis, as War Food Administrator, must be given full authority over the production, handling, and distribution of food in order to avoid disaster for the American people. He may not be able to correct all of the mistakes of the O. P. A., but I am satisfied that with full responsibility, he will put into operation plans for maximum production and better distribution, without raising prices to consumers. And, let me say right here, the farmers of the country are satisfied with the prices they are now receiving on most products. What is needed most, is the elimination of uncertainties in food planning, and by placing the control of food in the hands of an experienced official confidence will be restored, and we will go forward toward maximum production, as well as improvement in our distribution system.

I want to cite one illustration, and that is the case of corn. At the present time, war industries and other manufacturing plants are closing down because they cannot get corn, which is made into adhesives, gums, starches, sugar, sirup, and many other essential products. The Government owns more than 10,000,000 bushels of corn, and we are informed by the Department of Agriculture that there are several hundred million bushels of this product in storage in the commercial corn area. Thus far, those in charge of corn have not devised any way in which it may move to the industrial plants. Congress has no jurisdiction over this matter, but I can tell you frankly, that if something is not done about it promptly, all of the bakeries and candy manufacturers, in addition to manufacturers of corn products, will shortly close down.

Farmers in southern Minnesota engaged in dairy, hog, poultry and beef production are asking me to secure corn for them. I have urged the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell them corn from Government supplies which are now being stored in steel bins throughout the commercial corn area. You may wonder why we have a corn shortage in southern Minnesota, which is in the commercial corn area. The shortage in corn took place because the A. A. A. would not let our farmers plant enough corn in 1942 to provide feed for livestock on the farm without being penalized. For several years, I have tried to put through legislation which would permit farmers to plant corn for silage purposes in addition to their regular corn

allotment under the A. A. A. New Deal planners stopped favorable action on my proposal. If my suggestion would have been law in 1942, we would have had 500,000,000 bushels more corn on hand with which to feed 125,000,000 pigs, and large additional supplies to take care of beef cattle, poultry, and for all of the needs of industrial plants in the country. I am sure that under the direction of Chester Davis, this situation will be remedied for 1944, if he is given control over food production and distribution, but that is too late to do any good this year.

The time has come for a show-down if we are to meet our commitments, feed the men in the armed forces, and avoid famine at home. The administration refuses to act with intelligence, and it is, therefore, up to Congress to take action before it is too late, and that should be before we take the summer recess.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BREHM (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR) on account of death in immediate family.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, June 22, 1943, at 10 a. m., for further consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, June 24, 1943, for the consideration of bill relating to leave of absence to postmasters, and bill amending the act fixing the hours of duty of postal employees. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m.,

Tuesday, June 22, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 23, 1943. Business to be considered: Open hearings, Office of Price Administration officials.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 23, and Wednesday, June 30, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2203, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Friday, June 25, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments, room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

The subcommittee will also consider committee print No. 3, dated June 17, 1943, which supersedes committee print No. 2.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

506. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$42,500 (H. Doc. No. 240); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

507. A letter from Howard R. Stinson, representative of the United States, Belle Fourche River compact negotiations, transmitting a copy of the proposed Belle Fourche River compact between the States of South Dakota and Wyoming, together with a signed copy of his report on the compact and the

proceedings relating to its negotiation; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

508. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of April 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

509. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill "to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

510. A letter from the Secretary, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters for the year ending December 31, 1942; to the Committee on the Library.

511. A letter from the Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1942; to the Committee on the Library.

512. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the expenses of the offices of recorder of deeds and register of wills of the District of Columbia," approved April 24, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

513. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated November 11, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Crown Mountain water courses and their tributaries, island of St. Thomas, V. I.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. House Resolution 254. Resolution directing the Library of Congress to deliver to the Attorney General certain papers; with amendment (Rept. No. 568). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DISNEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2888. A bill relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; with amendment (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2540. A bill to regulate the possession, control, maintenance, and use of carrier pigeons; with amendment (Rept. No. 570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1381) granting a pension to Callie Ellis, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. R. 3012. A bill to create the Japanese Deportation Commission, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 3013. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of December 29, 1941, so as to make the provisions of said act applicable to officers or employees certifying to pay rolls of the Selective Service System for payment by Army disbursing officers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3014. A bill to provide for the making of loans and grants to veterans of the present war to aid them to purchase farms and homes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3015. A bill to amend section 403 (1) (1) (ii) of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended, relating to the exemption of contracts for raw materials with the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and the Maritime Commission, and subcontracts thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to suspend certain orders and proceedings under the provisions of title I and titles II of the Public Utility Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Japanese nationals and certain persons of Japanese descent should be deported at the conclusion of the present war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 3016. A bill for the relief of the Fidelity & Casualty Co. and the Baugh Chemical Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULKIN:

H. R. 3017. A bill for the relief of Hubert McMahon and Barbara McMahon, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1674. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Alice R. Mayhew and 18 others, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1675. By Mr. BRYSON. Petition of Edith C. Casterline and 14 citizens of Winters, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1676. Also, petition of Mrs. Pope Brooks and 12 citizens of Winnsboro, S. C., urging that the Farm Security Administration be continued under its present leadership and that funds for its operation be appropriated by Congress in an amount sufficient to extend its facilities to all farm families needing the kind of help which it provides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1677. Also, petition of Mary S. Kirk and 37 citizens of East Waterford, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration

of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1678. Also, petition of Bessie Lathe Scovell and 64 citizens of Cook County and Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1679. Also, petition of Rebecca T. Bigham and 13 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1680. Also, petition of Mrs. G. L. Endeman and 121 citizens of Bremerton, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1681. Also, petition of Anabel Boyle and 63 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1682. Also, petition of Anna McHatton and 57 citizens of Akron, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1683. Also, petition of Mrs. G. C. Reed and 21 citizens of Kirkland, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1684. Also, petition of Mrs. H. D. Cornish and 27 citizens of Osborne, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1685. Also, petition of 17 members of the First Methodist Church of Chula Vista, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1686. Also, petition of Minnie V. Reid and 20 citizens of Costa Mesa, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the

duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1687. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of 39 citizens of the State of California, urging the passage of House bill 2062, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1688. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco building and construction trades council, requesting the Administrator of the National Housing Agency to give consideration to San Francisco's most serious and acute housing problems to the end that priorities be granted for the construction of 5,000 modest homes for all workers in the war effort; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1689. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition transmitted by Arthur C. Menke, tourist court owner, of Las Vegas, Nev., and signed by some 35 other tourist court owners of the vicinity, protesting against Regulation 9A, issued by Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1690. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by George N. Taylor and 31 other citizens of Tillamook County, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1691. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of the Townsend Club, No. 1, of Deland, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1649; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 22, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. J. Warren Hastings, Ph. D., minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, we thank Thee for our heritage as a nation. We are thankful that our forefathers were led by Thy Spirit when they came to these shores and that Thy Spirit has been constantly in evidence in the life of our country. We are thankful for the resources of our land, our farms and cities, our great forests, and all the good things of life that Thou hast given us. We thank Thee for the great wide-open spaces, for the snow-capped mountain peaks, for homes and happiness and families, for schools and social institutions, for the indomitable spirit of our people, for the fact that all races and all classes are represented in the melting pot that is the United States of America. We thank Thee that beneath and above all of this is the most wonderful idealism in the world.

Wilt Thou, dear Father, help us to be worthy of our heritage? Help us to do our utmost to take all that has been passed on to us—passed on as institutions, as ideals, as hopes, as material gifts, as national traits and characteristics. Help us to take all these things

and use them and improve them during our period of service in this country. We realize, dear Lord, that we cannot lead and serve in human strength alone; that if we try to carry on, whether our job is big or little, and depend upon nothing but human resources, ultimately we fail. May we then, O Lord, work in the power of Thy Spirit as we serve and lead the people of this great Nation. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF PERU—UNION OF PAN-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY BODIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Peru, transmitting a motion or resolution of that body concerning the establishment of a committee having for its purpose the encouragement of the union of the pan-American parliamentary bodies, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

APRIL 1943 REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of April 1943, containing statement of loan and other authorizations, etc. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BELLE FOURCHE RIVER COMPACT

A letter from the representative of the United States Belle Fourche River Compact Negotiations, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation on the proposed Belle Fourche River Compact (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the board of directors of the New York Automobile Association, favoring a congressional investigation to determine whether there has been and is an unjust discrimination in the regulations pertaining to the distribution, sale, and use of gasoline in the eastern seaboard States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Hiram A. Spry, of Munith, Mich., praying for relief—special compensation—for an injury incurred by him while serving in the United States Navy during 1918 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Albert, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.